



Stylistics and the Theory of Literature

Author(s): Morton W. Bloomfield

Source: *New Literary History*, Vol. 7, No. 2, Poetics: Some Methodological Problems (Winter, 1976), pp. 271-311

Published by: [The Johns Hopkins University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/468507>

Accessed: 17/06/2014 17:41

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *New Literary History*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Stylistics and the Theory of Literature*

Morton W. Bloomfield

If language creates us, gives us meaning, what is the meaning of that meaning? Language gives us the means of *speech*, but what does speech *mean*?

(Octavio Paz [1971], p. 19)

WHILE NO DOUBT meaning many other things, the title of this paper suggests two main topics: (1) the place of stylistics in any overall theory of literary study; (2) the nature of stylistics and its possible contribution to certain branches of literary theory and practice. The first is concerned with the role of stylistics in any classification of literary study.¹ The second raises the question of what stylistics can contribute to particular aspects of literary theory—metrics, poetics, genre, figures of speech, structural organization, topoi, theme investigation, and, above all, literary evaluation. We shall be mainly concerned with the second topic in this paper.

I

Prior to all this, however, is the definition of stylistics itself, or at least a distinguishing of its various meanings. *Stylistics* is polysemous to a high degree. I do not wish to confine stylistics to any one aspect of its activity. Some, for instance, use the term as the equivalent, or slightly more linguistically oriented equivalent, of “explication de texte.” Although this kind of stylistics certainly belongs to the field of stylistics, the subject contains other varieties. I should like to try a simple inclusive definition which attempts to include all recognizable varieties of the subject. It is, in short, a descriptive, not a normative, definition that I am attempting. *Stylistics is the study or interpretation of the linguistic element or distinctive linguistic element in a writing, group of writings, or a text (that is, a structure capable of being interpreted by a code, including intentional structures like a culture or a whole language).* This definition is broad and somewhat vague because it must cover the wide range of activities known as stylistics and because it necessarily overlaps with other disciplines such as literary criticism, rhetoric, linguistics, and communication theory.

In these characteristics, however, it is in good company. Many words descriptive of a discipline or a literary subject are impossible to define in an Aristotelian manner. They must be called what Wittgenstein defines as "open class concepts." We cannot unify the definition by method, for beyond the demand for accuracy, exactness, and rationality—qualities we demand of any science—stylistics proceeds by a variety of methods and above all rests upon those vague qualities of intuition and common sense. Its method varies by the nature of its particular text or writing and by its goals. We cannot, like the Middle Ages, classify the sciences by the nobility of their subject matter (theology is thereby "the queen of the sciences") nor like our own times by the extent of their predictive power. Stylistics would rank fairly low in predictive power as its aim is not control but illumination and understanding. In social and historical activities, understanding is usually backwards not forwards. In any case, I am not concerned with establishing a hierarchy of the sciences.

The tentative definition I offer above also suffers from a fatal ambiguity in the word *linguistic*. Basically the question which arises is: what does *linguistic* include, and in particular does it include the semantic element in language? If so, to what extent? What is the semantic element? Is it only the referential aspect of words? This is a crucial matter, for if *linguistic* does include the semantic in the normal sense of the word, then simply to study the referential meaning of a poem is a stylistic task. What does it say?

In general, by *linguistic* in this context we mean the phonetic, syntactic, and simple lexical aspects of language. By "simple lexical aspect," I mean the nature of the words used rather than the meaning of the word. If we discover a tendency to use archaic, slang, latinate, or what have you, words, we are in the legitimate domain of stylistics. If we do include the semantic or referential element in some way, then we must broaden the definition of *linguistic*.

The lack of linguistic definitions of metaphor, of discourse, and other difficulties all signal a larger problem: the dependence of stylistics upon linguistics for its meaningful units, terminology, and theoretical impetus. Stylistics not only has its own problems, but in effect has many of the problems of linguistics to face. The success and progress of stylistics is closely related to the success and progress of linguistics. Even the direction of research in stylistics is much influenced by its parent discipline, as may be seen in the present tendency to abandon the study of individual style for the pursuit of semantic interpretations of texts.

In practice, the word *stylistics* is used in many senses, and this slipperiness of meaning, as we have said, is the root of our difficulty with defining the word.² Let us look at some of the uses of the word. Part of the quarrel over the legitimacy of stylistics³ in our time is due to the disparate meanings the term covers. We lack an agreed-upon definition or definitions, and this gap creates problems of method. No mere listing of

the major uses of the word is going to solve the problem of the role and function of an open concept like *stylistics*, but such an attempt at enumeration will help clarify its various usages. These usages to some extent overlap.

(1) *Aesthetic stylistics*. Some aestheticians use *style* in a metaphysical sense in their theories of beauty. Albert Hofstadter (1965) writes *inter alia*, "Style is the form that aesthetic rightness or truth of being in the show of the thing, takes in accordance with the particular life will that reaches articulation in the show."⁴

(2) *Theoretical stylistics*. This type is more frequently called poetics, although poetics probably goes beyond linguistic speculation. In effect, this present essay is an essay on theoretical stylistics. It deals with the question "what is literature, linguistically speaking?" It may wrestle with the nature and goal of stylistics, or even the stylistics of stylistics, a kind of metastylistics.⁵

(3) *Descriptive stylistics*. This phrase may be applied to attempts to describe the linguistic element in texts without attempting to evaluate them. It may be divided into (a) metric descriptive stylistics, which is primarily concerned with subjects such as meter, rhythm, intonation, and pitch—in short, the phonetic element (a theory of meter, however, belongs to theoretical stylistics), (b) structural descriptive stylistics, both mathematical and statistical and nonmathematical (primarily syntactic), and (c) lexical descriptive stylistics, wherein the vocabulary is studied and described. This type of stylistic activity is widely used and is often preliminary to another type of stylistic investigation or literary criticism. In some sense descriptive stylistics must be used in most stylistic study as the basis for comments on the style.⁶

(4) *Rhetorical stylistics* is the oldest of all the types of stylistic analysis and use, that part of rhetoric which deals with language and style as such. This type of stylistic work is communication- and audience-oriented. Stanley Fish calls it (or an aspect of it) *affective stylistics*.⁷ It is often descriptive as (3) above, but it makes use of classical and later rhetoric. In classical rhetoric, the theory of styles (high, middle, low) and figures of speech were taught and used in style analysis and usage. In modern times, the attempts to define linguistically style and dialect levels and figures, such as metaphor, metonymy, and personification, continue the interest of ancient and medieval rhetoric. Further, the attempt to define genres like riddles, proverbs, etc. may be regarded as another branch of this type of stylistics, inasmuch as genres to the extent that they were formalized traditionally were regarded as part of rhetoric and like all branches of rhetoric are audience- and reader-oriented.⁸

Language styles can be looked upon as dialects or registers with different functions—legal, religious, scholarly, menu, chemistry, advertising, and so forth. Styles can also be mixed or archaic⁹ or colloquial. Slang can be used. Robert Longacre (1970, p. 788) distinguishes various language

functions—narrative, procedural, expository, hortatory, dramatic.¹⁰ The study of the effect of diction on the audience is also part of this type of stylistic activity.

(5) *Historical stylistics* is the studying of style diachronically or synchronically if the style studied is limited to a certain period in the past. It differs from aspects of definitions (3) and (4) above mainly in its historical orientation. The work of Josephine Miles in English provides good examples of historical stylistics—the investigation of the linguistic changes in literary style (and presumably language) in English over the centuries.¹¹

(6) *Cultural and group stylistics* encompasses the study of characteristic styles of a whole culture, society, or a school or group of writers. It is closely related to historical stylistics, but differs inasmuch as it is not primarily determined by time divisions even if time past or present is to some extent taken into consideration in creating the unit studied. It deals with the linguistic elements in defining a civilization or group and may vary from Whorf's attempt (1956) to understand a *Weltanschauung* by analyzing its language presuppositions and Boman's attempt (1970) to distinguish ancient Greek from ancient Hebrew thought by an analysis of their respective languages, to an effort to define, say, the metaphysical school of poets by their use of language. Attempts to characterize a culture by its language are full of pitfalls which few have escaped.¹² Yet it cannot be entirely ruled out. If, as some think, the main task of the stylistic analysis of a work of art is to find the deviance from the "normal" use of language in a period or a school, then the "normal" style must first be determined in order to discover the linguistic peculiarities or differences¹³ of the artist. They must be set against the "norm." Different societies manifest themselves in different styles—conservative political language is not the same as radical political language. Protestant religious language differs from Catholic religious language. Lords talk differently from peasants. These different language uses are not quite the same as dialect or register differences discussed above under (4), although there are close resemblances. Here we are concerned with cultural distinctions which manifest themselves mostly in lexical rather than syntactic differences and reflect subdialectal distinctions for the most part—religious styles are found within the religious dialect, political language styles are found within the political dialect, and so forth.

An extension of this type of study, inverted in fact, belongs strictly speaking to the broader topic of linguistics rather than stylistics as such. It is an interesting structural variation, however, and deserves mention. It is concerned with how a particular language or language situation affects literature written in such a language or arising out of such a language situation. As far as I can see little has been done on this subject except for *obiter dicta*. The poetic potentialities of languages differ—each possesses, for instance, certain unique powers of verbal ambiguity. For instance,

son and *sun* may be played upon and used "poetically" in English but not in French language poems; whereas *tears* and *rain* offer word-play possibilities in French but not in English. The language situation of East European Jewry, to take another example, affected its Yiddish literature profoundly. Jews there grew up in a trilingual area wherein Yiddish was used for everyday life, Polish or Russian for contacts with the outside world, and Hebrew for their worship and spiritual life. This study, if to any serious degree possible, would not, as we have said, belong to the stylistics as here defined but rather to the study of the poetic situation of a language. Theoretically it would be part of linguistics or sociolinguistics.

(7) *Topographical or visual stylistics*. Because language, ever since the invention of writing, has a physical shape in the form of letters on paper, vellum, or stone, it is only proper to include the linguistic appearance of a literary work as part of stylistic study. There is a visual side to language—writing—and it is part of its total impact and message. Not only are there alphabetic acrostic poems or even poems in various shapes on paper, but even the visual effect of a "normal" poem or a prose piece on paper has its aesthetic significance. Its position on the page, the length of its lines, and so forth, are significant, especially though not exclusively for poetry. The fact that a line ends at one point rather than another, that poetry is justified only on the left in English, that rhythm and meter interplay with syntax and vocabulary in line endings and beginnings, and that the shape and sequence of letters are used to express poetry visually all make topographical stylistics a necessary branch of stylistics.¹⁴ Enjambment is not only a matter of vocal pauses or their absence (as indeed it is, strongly), but also of eye movement as well, determined by punctuation and spacing.¹⁵

Arrangement of the letters of a poem on a printed page (and even occasionally the color of the page) must be accounted part of its linguistic effect if it is written down. Deliberate misspellings, odd arrangements of words and letters (as in e. e. cummings' poetry), use of typographical signs, and lettering and font styles including capitals with the attendant spaces, are all legitimate subjects of this type of stylistics. The written medium must to some extent determine the style and be affected by the style of the artist.

(8) *Psychological stylistics* is the study of language and style in order to discover the mind of a man or writer. This type of stylistics, often associated with Leo Spitzer,¹⁶ stresses the element of choice in writing and what certain stylistic habits reveal of the author.¹⁷ The goal of this type of style study is to attempt to understand the mystery of literary creation.

Besides these eight varieties of stylistics, which are not based on any one principle of division, we can also divide it according to the three aspects of the writing or literary situation—author, work itself, audience. The first is concerned with the reasons for the author's use of language, the second with the linguistic aspect of the work as text, and the third

with the linguistic impact on the reader or audience. If we examine the element of self-reference in literature which is usually called foregrounding, we may look at it in these three ways under different headings. If we call self-reference *foregrounding* we are looking at it in terms of what the artist does; if we call it *autotelic* we are looking at it as a characteristic of texts; if we call it *intransitivity* we are looking at it from the point of view of the reader. We shall discuss foregrounding below,¹⁸ but I refer to it here to show how the literary situation can afford a more precise method of stylistic analysis in some cases. Unfortunately, it is less useful in other cases and blurs what are often important distinctions. We can, for instance, easily put (3) stylistics under the text aspect, (4) under the reader aspect, and (8) under the author aspect, but we should have trouble placing (1), (2), (5), (6), and (7) stylistics in these classifications.

Besides the different senses of the word *stylistics* and its potentialities for different subclassification, another source of confusion is its cross-relations with certain other disciplines or approaches to literary texts which are fashionable in our time, such as structuralism and semiotics, and even to older disciplines like poetics. Needless to say, stylistics in some of our eight senses of the word impinges upon and even penetrates these subjects. To clarify the exact relationships of stylistics to these subjects would take another essay in itself.

My purpose, however, is to distinguish them from stylistics in its normal significations. Individual structuralists, semioticians, and other similar scholars (like linguists and literary critics) have made even in their own work contributions to the realm of stylistics. However, a structural analysis of literature is only secondarily stylistics, and a semiotic analysis stresses fundamentally the referential aspect of the code displayed in the text.¹⁹

Because of these conflicts in meaning and the genuine difficulty of defining the term, some like Ellis (1970) and Gray (1969)²⁰ would do away with style altogether. Ellis says stylistic differences reduce themselves to differences in meaning. Not only does this theory at times contradict common sense, but it also makes all paraphrase or translation impossible in any reasonable sense of those words. All meaning is, in this view, dependent on a particular context. Stylistics is also more, as I hope I have shown, than analysis of particular works of art.

II

One of the problems to which many have given much attention in recent years is whether or not there is a literary, or poetic, language. To some this is the major problem of style investigation upon which the legitimacy of the whole discipline of stylistics rests. To them the whole matter of the relation of aesthetic value turns on the answer. To me this is not an important question, so long as one acknowledges a poetic use

of language. The figure in the Anglo-Saxon world at present who strongly urges that there is no difference between literary and ordinary language is Stanley Fish.²¹

The notion of a formal poetic language probably goes back to the Russian formalists.²² Since the development of formalism to the more specific notion of foregrounding, first put forth by Mukařovský of the Prague School in the thirties,²³ the idea of a poetic language has been widely held. A parallel though rather different development took place in the twenties in the Anglo-Saxon world with the distinction made by I. A. Richards between scientific and emotive language, emotive language having no cognitive content except to indicate the mood or opinions of the poet.²⁴ Fish wishes to deny that there is a poetic language whether it be characterized by foregrounding or not. Language is one; it is only differentiated by its use and function determined by the effect desired. There is a poetic use of language, but it does not differ fundamentally in its form from any other use of language. Language is "an experience rather than . . . a repository of extractable meaning."²⁵

Fish belongs to the new school of the speech act which stresses the speech situation in communication, not only what is said but how. This school goes back in essence to J. L. Austin, who discusses the illocutionary force of sentences and was carried on and given detail by John Searle.²⁶ Fish has also been influenced by modern existentialist philosophy which stresses the content and particularity of experience. He believes (1) that there is no justification for "concentration on the verbal object in itself"²⁷ and (2) that language can only be distinguished by its effect. Both of these beliefs make for confusions of a serious sort. I wish, however, to make it clear that effect analysis, which goes back to ancient rhetoric,²⁸ is a legitimate mode of investigation. In modern times indeed very little serious attention has been paid to it. Fish's analyses are very welcome. Moreover, I myself have pointed out how foregrounding is not a unique element in "poetic" language but is built into every use of language by the presence of grammatical (as opposed to referential) words.²⁹

The difficulty of an exclusively effect-oriented approach to language is that it ends in pure subjectivism—what Wimsatt calls the "affective fallacy." The reader and audience who experience literature in Fish's analyses tend to be Fish—and more power to him. Ultimately the method leads to a morass of subjectivity unless controlled by experiments on reader response, and some are certainly possible. We left impressionism in the thirties; now we are going back to it with a more sophisticated approach and a more technical vocabulary. No doubt a morass of subjectivity is no worse than a morass of objectivity, but I do not see why we need to be trapped in either. My objection to Fish's theory is to his monistic claims. There are various ways of understanding verbal objects.

The verbal object, if it exists independently of our minds, needs to be investigated as far as it can be. True, we never experience the object in itself³⁰ but always in an environment. Separation from the speech act

and environment is justified heuristically. We need to understand the chemical elements in themselves before we understand them as we usually meet them in the world, *in situ*. H_2O is not the experience of water; but this symbol helps us to understand what water is, and more importantly it enables us to do things with water we could not otherwise do. A work of art for Fish exists only as it is being read linearly. It has no existence independent of its readers or listeners (hence no text and no ontic status). In effect, statements about the work of art as a whole rest on very dubious foundations. A reading of the poem or even part of the poem cannot be corrected by any reference outside the reader. Just because pure objectivity in analyzing literature is impossible, does not mean that anything goes. It seems to me that Fish sadly mistakes the role of intellectual endeavor and does not understand the value of normative and systematic thought.

Effects have causes and causes lie outside of effects. Different effects have different causes or combinations of causes. In the case of communication these different causes or concatenations of causes must lie in the verbal object (or text). It is easier to analyze the text than to analyze personal or audience reactions (though I would not forbid them), and some kind of objective test is possible. There is, hence, an advantage in studying the verbal object in itself, although we must recognize that it has to some extent been abstracted from its environment. However, I do not mean to deny the validity of either psychological analysis of creator or reader (or listener) or of textual analysis *per se*. Each has its place.

I do not, furthermore, rule out a separation of language by its use and effect from its own structure and the legitimacy of the study of each. What we mean by poetic language may well be the poetic or literary use of language.³¹ Roman Jakobson, the father of modern stylistics, at least in western Europe and America, has always maintained that the poetic function cannot be limited to poetry or poetry be confined to the poetic function. If one does so, it is "an excessive and deceiving simplification." He has furthermore always used the word *poetics* for his stylistic analyses and theorizing, never *stylistics*. He has always recognized that whether there is a "poetic" language or not, the important thing is the "poetic function." This is true because one can still analyze poetry or literature by conceiving of the language employed as function or as a separate dialect or structure. Both or either can be used without any basic difference. Fish insists on function or purpose only. If by poetic language we mean language used for poetic purposes or a special dialect used in the writing of poetry or other literature, it makes no difference in most cases for poetic analysis. It makes a metaphysical but not much of a literary critical difference. At times, however, we do want to talk about the mode of existence, or the "beingness," of a work of art.

If we think of "poetic language" as ordinary language used in a poetic way, then we reintroduce the distinction driven out on the highest level into a lower level as a function or use. But whether we make this distinction on the highest or lowest level, we must still use the distinction if not

between poetic and nonpoetic language then at least between the poetic and nonpoetic uses of language. La Rochefoucauld believed all deeds were self-interested, but he did not thereby remove the necessity of introducing unselfish deeds—for in his scheme we must have selfish self-interested and unselfish self-interested actions. The distinction thrown out on one level comes in on another. Hence if Fish wishes us to distinguish language by its use, then the subject of stylistics is language in poetic use rather than poetic language. I prefer on heuristic, if not on other, grounds to study either poetic language or language used poetically and see what is being done with it.

III

Another basic theoretical problem at present facing stylistics is that of evaluation. One of the most frequent charges against stylistics by literary critics is that it ignores the aesthetic value of what it studies.³² These critics claim it makes no difference to stylistic analysis whether the text of its interest is a telephone directory or a sonnet by Shakespeare. The proceeding of many stylistic critics violates the New Critical doctrine that the actual linguistic facts of a work of art are of no relevance to an appreciation of it unless they can be shown to have relevance to its "meaning" (semantic meaning). In other words, it is all right to show the existence of, say, phonetic or syntactic repetition in a poem if the "meaning" of the poem is related to the idea of repetition (say a poem on the endless round of everyday existence), but otherwise not.

In the current debate over stylistics or whether linguistic knowledge is relevant to the understanding of a poem or whether in short there is, as Roman Jakobson says, a grammar of poetry,³³ the notion of organic form, going back to Cicero³⁴ but coming into its own in Coleridge and the German romantics with its apotheosis in New Criticism, plays a major role. This notion emphasizes as a criterion of success in art the unity of parts, ideally so closely compacted that every part contributes to the whole and no part would be absent without a serious loss. A work of art is like a living organism which, ideally, has no appendices. Although I know of no literary work to which this notion can apply except on rare occasion, and although it eliminates a priori as art all literature save lyric poetry, it has had great success in contemporary literary theory. It is probably the last echo of the romantic theory of art to the effect that, as Schlegel put it, literature is the "sichtbare Erscheinung des Reiches Gottes auf Erden."

A main thrust of modern criticism of stylistics has been based on this point, then—linguistic stylistic analysis is largely irrelevant to the meaning and hence the aesthetic element in the art object studied.³⁵ And indeed it is a basic theoretical problem in stylistics. It is also a practical problem, for, as W. O. Hendricks puts it, "if overt grammatical patterns

are irrelevant to the thematic structure of a poem . . . then much of the work in linguistic stylistics would seem trivial.”³⁶

The problem of the meaning of a poem is very complex and cannot of course be settled here. The question of the validity and value of linguistic stylistics turns on the question of whether the meaning of a poem is exhausted by its semantic content.³⁷ First of all, a distinction must be made between lyric and nonlyric poetry and between the normal uses of poetry and prose. The element of self-reference in language, the emphasis on the linguistic sign itself (foregrounding, as Mukařovský calls it), is essentially though not exclusively a feature of poetry, especially lyric poetry. The extent and degree of foregrounding moves from small in a prose novel to large in lyric poetry (and lyric poetry itself varies in its foregrounding). For all practical purposes one must concentrate for the question of evaluation on lyric poetry where the nonreferential use of signs is extensive. If meaning applies to nonsemantic and self-referential use of language in lyric poetry, its most concentrated form, it can be assumed to be elsewhere, and the principle may be extended to other varieties of literary form.

Second, I do make the assumption that there is in lyric poetry a kind of special emphasis on language as such, on the sign, as well as on the references of the signs (the normal semantic element). If we do not make this assumption we cannot, I think, make any difference between poetic and nonpoetic language, or if you prefer, the poetic and nonpoetic uses of language.

In the last analysis, of course, it is only intuition that makes this distinction and recognizes a difference in degree of self-reference in poetic and nonpoetic uses of languages. But there is supporting evidence of a most convincing kind. Repetition and parallelism in the widest sense of the words are continually and universally used in poetry.³⁸ This technique can only be for self-reference or emphasis or both with originally possibly performative and magic aims. Stress or prominent position will give emphasis to words (or their references), but for self-reference (attention to its own form) only repetition will give both emphasis and autotelism. A strong perception of the form or shape of the words accompanies the pleasure derived from poetry. One can appeal here only to the psychology of aesthetic enjoyment. Self-reference must be at the very least a strong element in the widespread and universal use of this characteristic of poetry.

Great poetry cannot be successfully paraphrased without a sense of loss. The actual words in their actual order,³⁹ sound,⁴⁰ and rhythm must be of the utmost importance in creating poetic effect in a certain context. The intransitivity of poetry, its autotelic element, is obvious to anyone who reads it. The total effect of a poem is due both to what it says about the world and the persona or personae (with the implied reference to the poet himself in some sense), that is, its semantic element, and to what it says about its own language.⁴¹ The latter may have meaning too as, say, music

has meaning, but it is not ordinary referential meaning. Its "meaning" or significance is iconic and may refer to abstract notions like suspense and interruption, relaxation and tension, coloring and timbre, sameness and variation, and so forth.⁴² Deep in man, as Nietzsche has said, is the horror of apparent meaninglessness. He cannot stand the arbitrariness or contingency of the world of language. He must put significance into it if he can. Language can serve this end in various ways. Puns, word play, repetitions, parallels are there to provide significance to his language—the sign must echo the wanted meaning. Even the role of parts of speech functions to some extent to handle the unexpected and contingent—noun classes, for instance, enable man to manage the world and control the new. If poetry has any magic, it must be in its "language" meaning, not merely in its referential meaning.

This abstract "nonreferential" level of a poem is what Koch⁴³ calls its autotelic (or autelic) value ("saying that its message is oriented towards itself"), which is the same as what has been called self-referentiality or foregrounding. The word or phrase calls attention to itself—its sounds, rhythm, intonation, and/or syntactic use. Referentiality in this circumstance, unlike visual word use, takes second place or seems less central. As I have pointed out elsewhere,⁴⁴ ordinary language in its use of grammatical words, those words which pertain to the sentence itself rather than the extrasentential world, is also autotelic or self-referential. This characteristic foregrounding, unlike special "poetic" foregrounding, is created by the language rules themselves.

Foregrounding is a linguistic mode of the widespread process of attention-getting and has some of the hypnotic effects attention-getting creates. Self-reference has a kind of magic and occurs in logic and mathematics as paradox and contradiction as well as in the basic processes of living, like time or consciousness. What Quine calls "opaque" as opposed to "transparent" reference is self-referential in a strong sense: *Dog* in "Dog is a three-letter word" cannot be replaced by *canine*. Yet one can do so in "Dogs bark." The classical Russellian paradox of the class of all classes which are not members of themselves embraces a variety of human experiences and knowledge. On a referential level we find such paradoxes when Odysseus hears about his own exploits in the poem about his exploits or when Don Giovanni in Mozart's opera hears some music by Mozart (only to dismiss it). Or in the Pentateuch we have a revelation about a revelation (part of the revelation is to tell how the revelation comes about). Or in jokes such as Groucho Marx's remark that he would not care to join a club that would be willing to have him as a member. Self-referential paradoxes lie deep in human experience.

The autotelic devices of the work of art range from an elaborate and extensive use in lyric poetry to a simple and minor use in journalism and scientific papers. There is a scale of intensity of use which may vary in different language functions extensively. In lyric poetry it is most frequently and heavily used; hence lyric poetry is the most memorable of all

poetry. Foregrounding is achieved by the use of repetition⁴⁵ and parallels, by grammatical deviance of some sort, by deliberate ambiguity which forces a close inspection of the word and its context, by collocations of various sorts. Foregrounding, however, does not automatically create literary interest or merit.⁴⁶ It must be considered in conjunction with the total impact of the sentence or discourse in which it occurs. Essentially only intuition can answer the question as to whether it is successful—but it must first be specifically identified. Much stylistic work must consist in identifying the linguistic elements of a text, especially though not exclusively the autotelic elements.

These foregrounding elements, besides being an attention-getting device which tends to mesmerism and magic, also attempt to impose meaning upon the arbitrary signs of language. By repetition and parallelism particularly, the writer, as I have said, imposes meaning upon the meaningless noises which make up the bare bones of language. Man is thereby protesting against the irrationality of language. When he feels deeply or wishes strongly to impart something valuable, he makes his language itself, his means of expression, significant by echoing in a magical way the sense.

The emphasis on the means of communication, the language as language, may, as we have already pointed out, be looked upon from the artist's point of view, from the audience's point of view, or from the point of view of the text itself. The various words we have been using for this process really differ in their points of view. If we emphasize the artist's work in emphasizing language as such, we may call it foregrounding. If we emphasize the audience's reaction to foregrounding, we may call it intransitivity, a resting in the words, phrases, and sentences themselves. If we emphasize the foregrounding as it appears in the text, we call it autotelic.

The lexicon as a group of words (especially referential words) used by the writer needs special attention in the attempt to understand the total impact of the poem, for the lexicon carries the largest semantic burden of all the language elements. Most words are referential and hence provide "just that information which the syntactic and phonological rules would not predict."⁴⁷ They must occupy a special role in the interpretation of the poem and must in the first analysis give it its rationale and what one may call its meaning center. All other grammatical devices are in some way subordinate to this center. This role does not mean that every linguistic device and self-referential element must be seen as contributing to the open meaning of the poem. A poem also has an ambient meaning in at least two senses of the word. First, meaning may be reinterpreted over time and hence has various "faces." In some sense re-interpretations and new interpretations must also be in the poem ready to be uncovered. These ambient features when revealed often become open meanings but not necessarily. Some criteria of corrigibility must distinguish, say, the legitimate from the illegitimate re-interpretations of a text. At present, they are intuitive and commonsensical, but there are possi-

bilities of more objective methods such as assumptions of greater unity, novelty, and complexity, to use S. R. Levin's terms (1971, p. 39). Second, a poem has a very abstract, almost wordless meaning to which the linguistic devices strongly contribute. On the phonetic level, Fónagy calls them "phonetic gestures"⁴⁸ to which we may add syntactic gestures. These create a secondary or ambient meaning which reinforces by support or opposition, by strangeness or familiarity, by simplicity or irony the open meaning, thereby contributing to the overall impact of an aesthetically dense text such as a successful lyric poem.⁴⁹ If we do not adopt some such position, it is hard to see what language has to do with poetry.

The organic theory of art which has been dominant in our time usually under the name of New Criticism, has been very critical of the secondary kind of reinforced meaning conveyed by linguistic devices and the linguistic elements. It is said that they do not contribute to the understanding of a poem which is assumed to have only harmonious and open elements. It is hard to find any poem in which everything contributes to the meaning and nothing superfluous is present, yet the organic theory is still widely held. A secondary (purely linguistic) meaning must, I think, be assumed to explain the majesty and harmony of linguistic devices which cannot be "reduced" to the assumed overall meaning of the poem.⁵⁰

IV

I have only vaguely defined the object of study in stylistics as the text or work or writing. What exactly is the unit that is being studied in stylistics? Linguistics as a discipline has only rarely ventured "beyond the sentence," a phrase which is the title of the last chapter of Archibald Hill's book (1958, p. 406). His chapter deals briefly with what he regards as beyond the proper scope of linguistics. He writes that one definition of stylistics is that it "concerns all those relations among linguistic entities which are statable, or may be statable, in terms of wider spans than those which fall within the limits of the sentence" (p. 406). The Polish aesthetician and philosopher Ingarden calls this unit the sentence-complex (*Satzzusammenhang*) which forms the skeleton basic unit of a literary work.

Modern transformational and generative grammar (TG) and the structural linguistics of the thirties, forties, and early fifties agree in few points, but one point of agreement is that both take the sentence as the basic unit of linguistic study. This limitation makes possible clear concepts and manageable grammatical statements. The basic literary unit, however, is not the sentence but the discourse, or text. Until there is a linguistics of the discourse, or text, if such is ever possible, there is little hope of working out satisfactory deep linguistic structures of various texts.⁵¹ It is no accident that the most successful stylistic analyses of whole texts have

been on relatively short and self-contained discourses like lyric poems and folktales.

It is possible, of course, to do some deep linguistic structural analysis of a whole and large text but the range of suitable works is limited. To delineate linguistic rules for a normal literary work involves extremely complex analysis on various and numerous levels. For some kinds of literary comparison as well as metrics, TG rules can, however, be worked out even if they are not purely linguistic.⁵²

Deep-structure analysis of most literary works poses complicated problems, especially if we define stylistics as the "study of the linguistic element." However, various other types of text classification are possible. Some linguistic patterns and distinguishing features can be discerned, many of which can be of help in literary interpretation. Narrative texts have attracted much interest in recent years and some success has been attained—in folktale in particular.⁵³

Recently there has been much interest in France in narrative analysis, but little of it is linguistic in the strict sense of the word.⁵⁴ Inasmuch as transformation is no longer considered to be exclusively a matter of deeper structure, narrative surface features may sometimes be analyzed in this manner. In my Bucharest paper delivered in 1967, I contrasted Boccaccio's *Decameron* 10:10 with Chaucer's "Man of Law's Tale" as transformations of each other (1970). Van Groningen earlier analyzed archaic narrative and the use of transposition and intercalation episodes (1958). Barthes (1971) and Cumming, Herum, and Lybbert (1971) attempted to classify the relation between sequences or sentences in narrative in a suggestive way.

The use of TG to analyze style in narrative received a great if confused boost with Richard Ohmann's 1964 essay contrasting Faulkner's sentences with those of Hemingway.⁵⁵ In his wake we have Curtis Hayes (1968) and, even more interesting, Carlota Smith's study of a discourse by Bertrand Russell (1971), which moves from sentence analysis to discourse or text. The aim of her analysis is to find structures that are characteristic of Russell's discourse and to give an explanation of why they were chosen. Emphasis, topic, and comment are features of discourse as such rather than the sentences of the discourse. And there are many other features. I am interested in theory-of-discourse style analysis here rather than particular analyses, of which there are many.

The problem of applying TG to a poem with its repetitions and deviations has occupied various writers in the past decade. Thorne (1965) and Levin (1963a, 1964, 1965) debated whether a special grammar with low-level rule differences had to be generated for the poetic language or not. Normal grammatical generation is used by Levin to determine deviation—if the sequence cannot be generated by the rules, it is deviant and hence foregrounded. Deviance in syntax, "ungrammaticality," is not always easy to determine given the rich potentialities of all living languages and of the great variability possible in situations.⁵⁶

The problems of rules generating a particular work of art are numerous. What we have in such a case is an attempt to generate a unique work, as if we had a language of only one sentence.⁵⁷ It is further complicated by the fact that it is the uniqueness of the work of art which gives it its aesthetic value. Rules cannot account for uniquenesses. Yet without a knowledge of the "regularities," so to speak, of what a work shares with other works, whether of vocabulary, meter, genre, or what have you, the "irregularities" and uniquenesses cannot be precisely pinpointed. Furthermore, the aesthetic density of a work of art contributes to its total effect, and the unique seen against a different regular or common background will differ in itself. The regular needs to be determined as well as the unique in order that the latter may be truly seen.

A literary work is not just the addition of sentence to sentence, not just a string of sentences,⁵⁸ but has some viability as a whole, though not necessarily an organic whole. We have had some attempts to establish the grammar and rhetoric of discourse. This is an important matter for the future of stylistics and one that will take time to solve—if it is at all possible. If it is not possible we shall have to settle for a different kind of stylistics—with emphasis on the psychology of the author or a descriptive stylistics on the surface level.

Whether it will be possible, then, to create a text or discourse grammar is an open question. There is no doubt that interesting and important things can be said about texts, but to what extent these can be linguistic other than descriptive is not clear. Semantic types of discourse analysis are possible and indeed have been made.⁵⁹ Other approaches are possible, and some preliminary attempts have been made by Max Bense from a mathematical and information-theory point of view.⁶⁰

The most important recent work on text grammars (and much more) is by Teun van Dijk (1972). It is by no means definitive, but it raises important questions and attempts to lay down a provisional framework for the theoretical description of discourse. His bibliography is also valuable. Again and again, however, van Dijk manifests dissatisfaction with his own treatment, but he points out what must be done if any text grammar is to be possible at all.

The text itself creates problems of interpretation. It is itself the link between past and present and is a guarantee of the future. It unites all time. It enables the work to exist without being performed—the movement from oral to written tradition is a momentous one. Text itself becomes an end in itself, a separate reality. A grammar is demanded of it as one might demand a grammar of a sentence. Rules which can create it are called for. It also creates new texts and new works and generations of texts. It prolongs a work over time and becomes the bearer of the work. Yet the bearer of the work, the text, and the work itself are somehow intertwined. The text is the beginning and the end of a work of art, like the body itself. It is a substitute for memory but is more accurate than memory. The text makes possible literary accuracy and creates a kind of standard.⁶¹

V

We shall here discuss two subjects to which we have already alluded: the possibility of linguistic definitions of (a) figures of speech and literary techniques and (b) genres.

Figures of speech have been defined in the rhetorical tradition both linguistically and semantically, though in general semantically. It is advantageous to get as objective linguistic definitions of tropes as possible, inasmuch as figures of speech give in varying degree an insight into the nature of the text and of literature. Some, like antanaclasis (repetition of words or phrases in a witty sense), tmesis (insertion of a word or words between part of another word), or hypocorisma (use of pet or diminutive names or words), serve only as handles for convenient classification, amply justifying Samuel Butler's jibe "For all a rhetorician's rules/Teach nothing but to name his tools" (*Hudibras* I.i. 89-90). Others, however, like alliteration, apostrophe, personification, metaphor, simile, synecdoche, or metonymy are not mere identifying or naming devices but often of the very essence of literary endeavor. All these latter figures sometimes serve the need for repetition or parallelism, sometimes for emphasis, sometimes for illocutionary functions, sometimes for retardation, for antithesis, or for decoration.

Figures of speech are not entirely extrasentential in reference but to some degree intrasentential and autotelic in reference. In some cases they are highly autotelic. Not only does the use of certain figures of speech act as reinforcement of meaning and serve as ornaments, but in some cases they actually set the limits (and hence the capabilities) of a work of art. The use of alliteration or assonance or personification allegory immediately defines the area in which the author is moving and provides him with a set of rules which he has chosen to use creatively. A partially linguistic and structural theory of rhetoric and figures has recently been elaborately presented by J. Dubois et al. (1970).

Much yet remains to be done, but some interesting work is available on linguistic definitions of some figures of speech. Paolo Valesio (1967) has been particularly active in such work. His book on alliteration, which is both theoretical and specific and which covers a range of languages, deals with alliteration in its various aspects but above all as language and its repetitive use in sound and syntax.⁶² He is much indebted to Jakobson's varied writings. There has been some success with linguistic approaches to personification by Valesio (1969) and Bloomfield (1963).

The most complex and difficult of all figures of speech to analyze linguistically is the metaphor, which is not only central to literary endeavor but is perhaps the most widespread of all tropes. It is extremely difficult to define. Its sister but much less interesting trope, the simile, is easy to define linguistically, as its normal definition is based on a linguistic sign—in English *like* or *as*. Unless a whole literary work is based on a simile or on simile structure or on the extensive use of similes, a normal simile is

uninteresting stylistically, although semantically it may be of great interest.⁶³ However, similes can easily be defined in linguistic terms.

The case is different with metaphors, which may be regarded as an elliptic simile. By the omission of *like* or *as*, a primary semantic violation takes place somewhat parallel to a grammatical violation on the syntactic level. It is a category mistake which is helpful in some mysterious way. So when one says "my love is a rose" one is violating the normal linguistic or logical categories: this example is rather mild compared to some of the possible and actual violations. Just as languages have their phonotactic rules (allow certain and disallow other phonetic combinations), so they have in some sense their logotactic rules. Levin (1963b) writes, "Metaphor is one form that projection takes, and it is one of the primary mechanisms for logotactic extension" (p. 32). In its early uses (before it becomes stale if it continues to be used), it serves as a kind of semantic deviance like grammatical deviance, and like it serves a foregrounding function, although in the metaphoric use we have semantic, not generally syntactic, foregrounding. Whether we can ever define metaphor linguistically is an open question.

Ever since Aristotle, moreover, metaphors have been seen as essential in some way to poetic discourse. This is of course primarily true of lyric poetry, but in all literary uses there is a heightening of the everyday, ordinary tendency of language users to employ metaphors. They please when appropriate, especially when they surprise by their boldness; they add a new insight and are a great part of the pleasure which the right use of language produces. Metaphors are a type, perhaps the major type, of analogy, the mode whereby one speaks of God in theology and of the obscure and intuitive in literary, humanistic, and even philosophical discourse.⁶⁴

The difficulty in defining metaphor, not only in linguistic but in any terms, has been explained by Dr. B. Leondar (1968) when she writes, "the term is itself metaphoric. It subsumes a set of instances which shares a body of common characteristics, but shares them in widely differing proportions" (p. 68). Jacques Derrida (1974-75) says more or less the same thing when he says one must use metaphors to describe metaphors. Modern linguistic philosophers have had as little success as others. Hester (1967) has pointed out that Wittgenstein's notion of meaning as "use" does not work with metaphor. There is no court of appeal which can tell us why time is like a beggar.⁶⁵ Ever since Max Black wrote his famous article on the subject (1954-55), progress has been virtually nonexistent.

Language use in any sense seems impossible without metaphors. Not only are past metaphors buried in it but they are the "very condition of our knowing anything at all" about the world as experienced. C. Mason Meyers (1965-66) tries to distinguish vicious or nonvicious circularity in metaphors. A metaphor, like "seeing with the mind's eye," he argues, doesn't help understanding, because seeing involves the concept of understanding. On the other hand, he continues, when Berkeley says in the

Alciphron that visual perception is a kind of hearing with eyes, we have nonvicious circularity in the use of that metaphor.⁶⁶ The problems of a linguistic theory of metaphor are discussed by R. J. Matthews (1971) in an article which contributes to clarification of the problem. However, one cannot say that much success has so far been attained in defining metaphor satisfactorily in either linguistic or philosophical terms. There is, of course, not much difficulty in knowing that it is being used.⁶⁷

Certain genres have always been defined linguistically. The sonnet is a poem of 14 lines with one of several rhyme schemes and with lines of 10-12 syllables.⁶⁸ A prologue is an introductory and separate beginning section.⁶⁹ A letter begins with a salutation and ends with a parting formula.⁷⁰ There are other examples of linguistically defined genres. The real problem arises with the more complex genres. Furthermore, it might be asked, why do we want to define genres linguistically?

Croce and his American disciple, Spingarn, in the early years of this century,⁷¹ carrying the romantic emphasis on the uniqueness of the work of art to its logical culmination, pronounced the final obsequies over the notion of genre. They were, however, premature and mistaken. Genre analysis and genre thinking are, and indeed were, by no means dead. It is true, however, that interest in and awareness of the importance of genre has increased greatly in the past two decades. The notion of genre is very much alive and interest in it is in fact growing vigorously.⁷²

With the increasing growth of interest in linguistics as well as language self-consciousness in the twentieth century, various attempts were made and are being made to define genre in linguistic terms. This is extremely difficult for complex genres like the novel or subtypes of the novel or epic poems. Linguistic definitions of genres would theoretically explain exactly what the particular author did or was doing with his particular work and how he deviated from the form. However, other forces than the genre form would be operating on him—his own psychology, his cultural milieu, his overall purpose. If “linguistic” is broadened to include semantic universals, such analysis would at least come closer to encompassing these complex influences.⁷³ Proverbs and riddles are much easier to analyze linguistically or structurally than “personal” works of art like novels, but even here semantic elements cannot be avoided.⁷⁴ It is doubtful, however, if more complex genres are going to yield quickly to linguistic definition, even with semantic universals included. The clash between normative and descriptive goals in defining genres is especially difficult to overcome. Furthermore, there are many types of mixed or unidentifiable genres.

VI

This last section raises one of the basic issues of much stylistic work—the possibility of creating a neutral deep-structure description of a literary work or genre.⁷⁵ Roland Barthes wrote in 1953 a collection of essays in

which he discussed "degree zero" writing.⁷⁶ By this term he means a kind of writing which "soaks up the style" (p. 57) and the disappearance of literature which is a "blind alley" (p. 93). Basically he believes that style is almost independent of language and is rooted in personality (a rather narrow view of style). However, if we take his expression in a different sense and apply "degree zero" to a neutral base with which all individual units of a specific sort (especially genres or subgenres or figures of speech or literary devices) can be compared, we will have a standard or a number of standards whereby true understanding and identification of the stylistic component can be arrived at and significant comparisons can be made. Older stylistics tried to find the unique features of a style or a work of art in order to discover the secrets of the artist and of creativity. However, with a neutral structure zero against which to set a work of art, we escape this kind of psychologism and base our analysis of style on human universals rather than an individual's own psyche. This neutral base could perhaps be in deep structure, but its location is not at all clear.

How can we distinguish in an individual style the common, normal grammatical from the purely stylistic, that which is idiosyncratic and personal—*l'homme même*, the personal selection of the writers? Vocabulary allows the greatest freedom for the writer because the "rules" of lexical use are relatively lax. I doubt, however, if we can ever generate vocabulary as such because it is difficult if not impossible to conceive of a neutral vocabulary. In fact, vocabulary may not for any use be generated. A neutral vocabulary is very difficult to conceive, though perhaps not impossible. In syntax, phonetics, and even theme and figures of speech, however, a mathematical or neutral language which is existentially indifferent seems easier to conceive. Stylistics is not limited to this type of investigation, as we have seen, but a neutral style or neutral styles, a degree zero of writing or of text, would be extremely helpful.

Although Fred Robinson is referring to simple, straightforward prose as opposed to poetry, his recent comment puts the problem in a very effective and forceful way: "any study of 'style' in a particular literary corpus presupposes a knowledge of exactly what 'unstyled' discourse in the language of that corpus is, since it is only by knowing how the words of a given passage would have been arranged in a neutral functional way that one can identify an arrangement which is skewed for stylistic effect."⁷⁷

At the present a scheme for a neutral, possibly deep-structure, style is utopian, but it may be possible at least for some genres or figures, even if not for all. The task is daunting, however.

It is important that this reconstruction be not psychological and historical (genetic) as, say, André Jolles attempted to do in his famous and remarkable *Einfache Formen* (1930), but truly synchronic and structural—and above all normative. It may be psychological only in the full structural sense of that word—resting upon semantic universals, not empirical emotions and feelings. Between Jolles and today, Jakobson, Lévi-

Strauss, and Chomsky have intervened. A new type of analysis is called for.

Difficulties abound—the boundless metaphoric powers of language, the necessity not only of locutionary meaning, but, to use Austin's terms, of illocutionary and perlocutionary meaning which depends not just on the linguistic structure before us but on the speaker's attitudes towards his utterance and towards the effect his utterance is supposed to have on his audience, both of which to some extent psychological, the definition of genres, of defining literary texts, and so forth. The attitudes are also to some extent linguistic, but they cannot always be categorized. Tallentire says with much force, "for the present at least, the most potent tool for stylistic evaluation remains the most basic, that of intuition."⁷⁸ Statistics and even ordinary TG analysis do not seem firm enough to build on, for they are limited to the actual corpus. Intuition needs a role—and here we may forsake science.

Yet all is not yet lost. Slow but sure progress is being made as we begin to see the dimensions of the problem. Nor is the purpose of stylistics exclusively that of evaluation, the most difficult and elusive of all stylistic tasks. However, even for nonevaluative and purely descriptive tasks, the setting up of rules or generative procedures for literary works of complexity will be difficult, not to speak of the even more difficult task of establishing the framework in which the rules can operate, a framework of neutral, descriptive deep-structure terms. This task may in part need the support of general linguists; yet the differences among them make it clear that agreement will not be easy or perhaps even possible. If it turns out to be impossible to generate literary works, stylistics has other methods at its disposal, as I hope I have shown.

On the level of genre, binary categories may help to explain literary universals as they may myths, but I suspect that only in folk and consciously generic creations will this goal be achieved. What we need for further progress is what James Fox calls for: a semantics of reference. Parallels of complementary, contrary, and contradictory terms have in common, as Fox points out, their relation to one another as a pair.

We will need, say, narrative universals, then, say, novel universals, picaresque (or what have you) novel universals,⁷⁹ all of them resting on linguistic or semantic universals, in order to begin to investigate Thomas Mann's *Felix Krull* or to compare *Felix Krull* with *Gil Blas* or to classify a novel which looks as if it might be a picaresque one. There is yet more—language, culture, personal and human psychology, and so forth—to explore in order to account for the work of art completely. Furthermore, the value of a literary work lies in large measure in its uniqueness. Perhaps, however, we do not have to account for a work of art *completely*—even partially will help if the partial study includes most immediately relevant levels.

The pursuit of a zero-degree definition of a complex genre seems a will-o'-the-wisp. For riddles and proverbs and other forms of oral literature, it

might be possible to get a neutral form from which all extant examples can be derived, or with which all extant examples can be compared. When the idiosyncratic is of minor or no importance, then the derivation of rules may be possible. This is largely the case in folk and oral literature.

Nor can we hold out much hope for stylistic universals, if by style we mean the idiosyncratic element in a work of art. However, stylistic features can be classified and some of them may be neutrally defined. Distinctive features can be identified, and it is possible to make matrices into which, by the use of + or — or $\emptyset$, say, personifications can be classified. However, style depends on too many specific and contingent elements, not to speak of the role or roles the audience plays and the way use and register impinge on the matter, to make the outlook other than bleak from this point of view.

Evaluation in stylistics remains a problem, but it is also a problem in all forms of art. Finally, I suppose, judgment must rest upon intuition, but it is the modes and ways after the fact of value that can satisfy us. We do not study the style of a work of art in order to learn "the secret" of composition so that we can create another. We study it to understand what is happening to us when we read or hear it, so that our reactions can be deepened and enriched. We study it to experience fascinating patterns. We study it to gain new insights into what the world is, phenomenologically speaking. It is because words in their literal form seem completely meaningless and only in the totality of their symbolical use become meaningful that the desire to know what is being done with words becomes an overwhelming demand. Most objects in the universe betray by their existence in some way their function or rationale, even if it is an unsatisfactory rationale; words by their sheer existence contain a special secret. Events may or may not be meaningless, but objects, and words are objects too, usually have some kind of rationality built into them. But words do not speak to us as words, only as purveyors of meaning; they are normally viewed only as signs. This is the challenge that the use of words as art poses to us: to get beyond literary words as signs.

It is commonly said that stylistics not only tells us nothing or little of the quality of what is being studied, but it is indifferent to it, provided its object is made up of words. We could operate with these tools, it is said, on the telephone directory as well as on Shakespeare. Stylistics is not by itself evaluative. Architecture is not very useful if we apply it only to children's blocks. A subject demands its proper application, and stylistics must be applied to works of art.⁸⁰ Once a literary function is seen to be in a text, stylistic analysis can help us to understand what is going on. Some of the repetitions, parallelisms, ambiguities, word play, and deviations will bear on the central point or points of the literary work directly, and others on the semantic ambience and expectation of such a work. Furthermore, the experience of reading or hearing some literary works must not be neglected. A work of art is not only its structure; it is also the experience of itself.

A work of art has both referential and nonreferential meanings which are conveyed by the language features of the text, some of which call attention to themselves by foregrounding, autotelism, and intransitivity, in different degrees and carry out in special ways what is already a feature of ordinary language communication. Magic transforms wisdom into something memorable.

Normative approaches to genre are also possible, a subject which I have not dealt with here. In that case, we can see the work as the suppression, expansion, or transformation of its generic rules. This topic needs further study, for this paper does not do much more than raise some of what I consider to be some of the basic theoretical problems facing stylistics. At present the subject is in a state of uncertainty. But the way lies ahead.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

NOTES

* I am much indebted for suggested improvements to and criticisms of this article to Professors Roman Jakobson and Irene Fairley.

1 I shall not discuss here the equally important topic of the place of stylistics in any overall theory of linguistics, although this too needs clarification. There are other general aspects of the subject I shall not discuss, such as the appropriateness of style to its context, both intratextual and situational, or how context determines style. See Enkvist (1974) and I. A. Richards (1974a), esp. pp. 10ff.

2 See Nils Enkvist (1964), a very useful essay on the problems of defining *style*. It does not, in my opinion, recognize enough meanings of the word. His recent useful book (1973) lays out in brief form many of the aspects of stylistics discussed here and in this book. It does recognize a wider range of meanings for the word *stylistics*, but, in general, his view is audience-oriented and would fall under definition (5) below. See also the useful distinctions made by Pierre Guiraud (1970) (the sixth edition of which has been heavily revised and updated). Guiraud distinguishes descriptive or expressive stylistics. This is a valuable little book. See also André Semproux (1961) for a history of the word *stylistics*. See Saussure's note on the various meanings of the word *style* when discussing the possibility of a chair of stylistics at Geneva, in Engler (1974), p. 51.

3 See below, pp. 278f.

4 See also parts of Richard Kuhns (1970), especially the chapter "Truth as a Value of Tragedy."

"Stil ist also die Gesamtheit der Züge an einem Sprachwerk, die ihm ästhetischen Charakter verleihen," Herbert Seidler (1970), p. 16.

5 See Lubomir Doležel (1967) who, assuming the existence of a poetic language, tries to define "specific features of poetic texts and of poetic language in general" statistically (p. 97); Miroslav Červenka and Květa Sgallová (1967); Jiří Krámský (1967); and Solomon Marcus (1970). See also n. 6.

6 A recent example of (3c) is Roman Jakobson and Lawrence G. Jones (1970). See also Rulon Wells (1960). On mathematical descriptive linguistics, see Bailey (1971); Lubomir Doležel and Bailey (1969); Solomon Marcus (1974); some of the essays in Jacob Leed (1966); and in Rul Gunzenhäuser and Helmut Kreuzer (1967); Wilhelm Fucks (1971). A mathematical analysis of a Kazakh poem (by Abay Kunanbayef [1845-1904] may be found in Hřebíček [1966]). On the dangers

of mathematical analysis of style, see Tallentire (1971b) and Le Page (1959) (on the difficulties of obtaining expected randomness).

7 See his appendix to (1972), pp. 383-427.

8 See, e.g., Charles T. Scott (1965). On the whole, only the simpler literary genres have received linguistic definition. Until a linguistic definition of discourse or text is possible (if at all), complex literary genres will not be easy to define linguistically.

9 See W. D. Lebek (1969).

10 On stylistic functions, see David Crystal and Derek Davy (1969). They have, *inter alia*, chapters on the language of conversation, of unscripted commentary, religion, legal documents, etc. See also Riffaterre (1964) ("Stylistics will be a linguistics of the effects of the message, of the output of the act of communication, of its attention-compelling function," pp. 316-17) and (1966); Karel Horálek (1966); and I. R. Galperin (1971b), pp. 253-331 (Section "Functional Styles of the English Language") and (1971a); and I. A. Richards (1974a).

11 See, e.g., her works (1948-51), (1964), and (1967). See also Klaus Weissenberger (1971), William E. Baker (1967), and Redin (1925).

12 See, e.g., Bruno Snell (1955). For a devastating attack on this method of ascertaining the characteristics of a culture or people, see James Barr (1961).

See also Meyer Schapiro's excellent essay on style (1953). He uses the word in basically this sense.

13 "Style is a difference," Jonathan Culler (1973), p. 357.

14 See, e.g., Barbara H. Smith (1968) and John Thompson (1961). On visual stylistics in general, see several essays in Schmidt (1971), esp. pp. 115-21, 138-54, 155-75; Fairley (1973b); Praver (1969). (Cf. G. B. Shaw's comments about the printing of the American edition of *Man and Superman* quoted in *TLS*, 18 Jan. 1974, p. 60: "Don't have patches of white or trickling rivers of it trailing down the page like raindrops on a window . . . Are they not horrible? *White* is the enemy of the printer. *Black*, rich, fat, even black, without grey patches are, or should be, his pride.") On concrete poetry, in particular, see Rudolf Arnheim (1974). Shape poems such as those by George Herbert are poems, John Hollander personally said to me in Oct. 1974, because they can be read, but most concrete poems are not because they have no oral content. See Hollander (1969) for his own shape poems.

15 See John Hollander (1973). Cary Nelson (1973) is an attempt to deal with verbal space, but the space is mostly conceived as internal to the work: what is described in words as space or what is metaphorically space. By *space*, Nelson often means "out of time" or timelessness, as when he writes, "Pure spatiality is a condition toward which literature aspires, but which it never achieves" (p. 3). Needless to say, my references to space mean something very different: the space the written text takes up on the parchment, stone, or page. The only actual space in Nelson is in the illustrations; ". . . the printed poem has powerful quasi-independent contributions to make towards the poem's overall being" (I. A. Richards [1974c], p. 69).

16 See, e.g., Spitzer (1948). Spitzer also attempts occasionally to enter the "mind" of a culture, subculture, or social activity (like advertising). See also Fritz Martini (1971), Claudio Guillén (1957), and Semproux (1960).

17 See Arrivé's criticism of "le style comme écart," (1972), pp. 22-23. Darbyshire (1971) defines deviation very broadly and does not limit it to individual choice. He defends a stylistics of deviation. For a good discussion of poetic "deviation," see Samuel R. Levin (1965b).

18 See pp. 281f.

19 On structuralism, see, e.g., the series *Qu'est-ce que le structuralisme?* (Oscar

Ducrot [1968]; Tzvetan Todorov [1968]; Dan Sperber [1968]; Moustafa Safouan [1968]; and François Wahl [1973]); Jean Viet (1965); Maurice de Gandillac (1965); J.-B. Fages (1967); Eugenio Donato (1967); Roger Bastide (1962); Richard Macksey and Eugenio Donato (1970) (esp. essays of Todorov, Donato, Derrida, and Barthes); R. Magliola (1973).

On semiotics, see Julia Kristeva (1969a); Umberto Eco (1967), (1968), (1971); Trabandt (1970) (in a glossematic framework); Bense (1967); Mounin (1970); Stephen Heath et al. (1971); and Robert Browne (1971-72).

20 See also Bersani (1972), and Wellek (1972-73). Hough (1969), esp. p. 19, defends stylistics.

21 See n. 7 and 1973 publication. Elias Schwartz (1970-71) argues that literature is not a species of language nor is its language distinctive. Literature, moreover, is not just strings of sentences (a rather narrow view of what poetic language could be). "There persists among critics of poetry the notion that the literal meaning and the poetic meaning are somehow opposed," Hungerland, *Poetic Discourse* (1958). She severely limits the scope of stylistics and then attacks it. Yet note Hungerland's own title.

22 See Erlich (1965) and Lemon and Reis (1965). For more recent Russian speculation on this topic, see I. R. Galperin (1971a). The French symbolists, especially Mallarmé, were probably the first to think in general terms of a poetic language, although as far as I know they did not use the term.

23 See Mukařovský (1964) and also (1971) (a translation into Italian of four of his essays emphasizing structuralism and semiotics).

24 See Richards (1924) and (1926).

25 Fish (1972), p. 426. Does language not exist when it is not being experienced?

26 See Searle (1969).

27 Fish (1972), p. 389.

28 See M. W. Bloomfield (1973).

29 See M. W. Bloomfield (1967).

30 I do not here wish to enter into the metaphysical and epistemological question of how a poetic work exists. It may be regarded as a series of directions or as a virtuality, as Varga (1963), pp. 220-21, has it, or as a real object as far as my purpose here is concerned. All I ask is that it exist independent of the reader in some sense. See also M. W. Bloomfield (1970).

31 See, on this point, Barthes (1967) ("Is There any Poetic Writing") and Barbara H. Smith (1970-71). Ruwet (1968) assumes one of the main characteristics of poetic languages is the fact that its primary meanings set up more subtle secondary ones and so on, a characteristic very difficult to pinpoint linguistically. Here, as elsewhere, is the continuing and persistent tendency to think of poetic language mainly as the language of lyric poetry, ignoring the language or languages of novel, fabliau, epic, satire, and so forth, which surely comprise the literary art.

32 See, e.g., Helen Vendler (1966) and Roger Fowler (1971) *passim*, including the two contributions by F. W. Bateson.

33 Jakobson has written so extensively on stylistics and the "poetry of grammar and the grammar of poetry" that it would be difficult to list all his writings here. Jakobson (1960) and (1968) (a revised English version of an earlier paper which had appeared in various versions) gives us a fairly good summary of his views on this topic. See, however, the 1971 bibliography of his writings for many other articles on the topic. Special attention to be paid to the Postscriptum to (1973), which is a recent defense of his position against his critics.

34 See his *De oratore* III. 178-79.

35 The issue has especially been brought to the fore by Jakobson's analyses of Baudelaire's "Les Chats" in 1962, (with Claude Lévi-Strauss) and Shakespeare's sonnet 129 in 1970 (with Lawrence Jones), which has led to criticisms by Michael Riffaterre (1966); by Jonathan Culler (1971), esp. pp. 64-65; and to some extent by Victor Erlich (1973). See the analysis of Jakobson's theories in M. W. Bloomfield (1970-71) and I. A. Richards (1974b). Vendler (1973) discusses the difficulty of Jakobson's theory of poetic analysis in presenting change in the poem and its tendency to lose sight of the poem's linearity.

The dispute over the value of linguistic and grammatical analysis of literature is of course much older. See *ibid.*, p. 165, n. 2 (Kogan), and p. 169, n. 13 (Wimsatt). See also on this subject Leo Bersani (1972).

36 (1973), p. 155.

37 This assumes, of course, that referential meaning need not be in the realm of linguistics in its ordinary sense. This level of reference is the major though not the only goal of linguistic communication and hence on the whole should probably not be included in the science of linguistics as such, although its impact on language forms and the means of reference cannot be ignored in any serious study of language. It may be conceived as part of the lexicon.

38 Even in languages where the sentence is not central, if Grimes (1972) is correct. On parallelism, see Mary P. Hiatt (1973) and earlier Jakobson (1966a).

39 See George Landon (1968), and Samuel Levin (1963a) and (1965b).

40 On sound and sense, part of the aspect of "meaninglessness" in context, see Benjamin Hrushovski (1968-69) (only context can brake or activate particular shades of potential expressiveness of sound); Ivan Fónagy (1961), (1963), (1971); Paul Delbouille (1961) (on a possible mode of reconciliation); Erik Fudge (1970); M. Nelson (1973); and M. W. Bloomfield (1953) (and references there).

41 "Le Poème change conjointement le monde, le langage et le coeur," J.-P. Manigne (1972). Cf. also S. Agosti (1971).

"Le langage poétique est à la fois sujet et objet, comme nous-mêmes, et par conséquent, comme nous, propre à toutes les relations et à toutes les significations possibles," J.-C. Renard (1970), p. 151 (see also p. 29).

42 See, e.g., Leonard B. Meyer (1956) and more recently Charles Rosen (1971), esp. pp. 19-29 and 57-98 (1972 ed.).

43 (1966a), p. 10.

44 (1967). Rpt. *Essays and Explorations* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 262-74, and Jens Ihwe, ed., *Literaturwissenschaft und Poetik, Ergebnisse und Perspektiven*, *Ars Poetica* No. 8 (Frankfort, 1971), II, 62-74 (in German).

45 Although nonlinguistic, there is now available an interesting book on repetition in the various arts. See Kawin (1972). See Starobinski (1971) for a study of Saussure's attempt to find anagrams of various sorts in Latin poetry—a kind of intellectual foregrounding. See also Hans Helmut Christmann (1974).

46 See, e.g., M. H. Short (1973), who emphasizes the element of the appropriateness of the foreground devices in the total context. No purely statistical approach to foregrounding will provide a measure of aesthetic worth. Reversals are a particularly interesting type of foregrounding. See I. A. Richards (1974c).

47 Mark Lester (1968-69), p. 369.

48 (1971), p. 160.

49 See W. O. Hendricks (1973), who refers to M. A. K. Halliday's stylistic analysis of Golding's novel *The Inheritors* in Halliday (1971); Halliday says of *The Inheritors* that "the syntax is part of the story" (p. 360). I would go further and say that most nonreferential parts of a text are "parts of the story." I do not see the clear division between the three alternative theories of non-

referential meaning which Hendricks alludes to on the final page of his review—reinforcement, aesthetic effect, and partaking seem to me more or less the same thing.

50 For further remarks on the organic theory of poetry, see below, p. 285.

51 Of course semantic or thematic structural analysis will be possible and indeed is widely practiced. Other restrictions also make deep linguistic analysis of a text difficult. Except for perhaps oral "texts" or folktales or certain genres, a literary grammar cannot "have as its aim the generation of a unique work . . . but rather to fundamental regularities as perceived on different levels." Pavel (1973), p. 13. A set of grammatical rules in a language which would only generate a unique sentence would not be of much use. So with, say, linguistic literary rules. But it may not be useful or even possible to find "the fundamental regularities" of most literary works or genres. See Bloomfield (1970), Hausenblas (1966), and Harweg (1973).

52 See the references at the end of the preceding note and W. O. Hendricks (1967) and (1974), and W. Koch (1966b).

53 See V. Propp (1958), W. O. Hendricks (1970), and an interesting early example of folklore analysis in Petsch (1900).

54 On structural narrative analysis, see Gérard Genette (1972), pp. 65-273; "Sémiotique Narrative: Récits bibliques," *Langages*, Jun. 1971, ed. Chabrol and Marin, containing eight articles on the subject by C. Chabrol, G. Vuillod, L. Marin, R. Père, E. Haulotte, E. R. Leach, and a bibliography. T. Todorov has a number of interesting and important structural analyses, e.g., (1969), (1970), and (1971-72). (See Hendricks' long review of Todorov [1969], in Hendricks [1972b].) We also have *Communications* 8 (1966), with articles by Barthes, Bremond, Greimas, Genette, et. al; Kristeva (1969) and (1970); J. Dubois et al. (1970), pp. 171-99; Greimas (1973); Lefebvre (1971); Pelc (1971); Hendricks (1972); Røder (1972); Ihwe (1972); Chabrol (Jun. 1973); Pavel (1973); and the Feb. 1972 issue of *Littérature*.

Interesting structural analysis of the nonlinguistic type is to be found in Eugene Dorfman (1969) and Fernando Ferrara (1973-74).

55 See also his later "Literature as Sentences" (1966). Ohmann's concept of "kernel" sentences and deep structure is misleading and unclear. See Hendricks (1974), p. 20, n. 11.

56 A good discussion of Thorne's and Levin's differences about how to generate a poem (with Riffaterre thrown in for good measure) may be found in W. O. Hendricks (1969).

57 See Pavel (1973), p. 13. Pavel suggests that a narrative or literary grammar should *not* have as its aim the generation of a unique work or even set of unique works "but rather to account for the fundamental regularities as perceived on different levels."

58 See Schwartz (1970-71), pp. 189-90.

59 See W. A. Koch (1965) and (1966), and Itamar Even-Zohar (1972). Siegfried J. Schmidt (1973) puts the problem of text analysis in a different context—the science of literary communication—a shift which has interesting possibilities. This approach would, of course, be very linguistically oriented while emphasizing the communication and audience aspect of language and text. (Compare Fish's work above, pp. 277f.) See also S. J. Schmidt, ed. (1970) (which contains a collection of essays on semantic analysis by Wiener, Hartmann, Hoppe, van Dijk, Ihwe, Delius, Imdahl, Vukovich, as well as the editor, and a concluding discussion section [pp. 217 ff.]). See also W. Dressler (1972), J. S. Petőfi (1972), and Roland Harweg (1973).

60 See, e.g., Bense (1962); see also Schmidt (1970).

61 I am indebted in this paragraph to some ideas suggested by Professor Edward Said. See his (1973).

62 For one of the few treatments of assonance, see Percy G. Adams (1973) (not linguistically oriented but an interesting and good paper). An unusual linguistic analysis of irony may be found in Prentice (1973). Truth conditions in some types of irony are askew. He writes, discussing the sentence, "he is a true partner": "In the ordinary, non-ironical use of language the condition upon which the truth of this sentence depends is that the noun phrase 'he' and the verb phrase 'is a true partner' denote the same referent. But when the sentence is used ironically the condition that regulates its truth is that 'he' and 'is a true partner' do not denote the same thing at all. Thus the grammatical structures $S \longrightarrow NP + VP$ carries truth only on the condition that $\longrightarrow NP$ (neg) VP . In other words, the truth of the proposition 'p is q' depends upon its falsity: it can be true only if p is precisely not q." See also Besharov (1956) for an excellent tropic analysis of a literary work (*Igor's Tale*). It is structural in deed if not in name. Lausberg (1960) presents classical rhetoric and its figures and tropes with amplitude.

63 See, e.g., J. Applewhite on Dante's use of simile (1964); S. G. Darian (1973); and S. N. Kramer (1966).

64 See Ralph McInerny (1961) and (1968), and G. Söhngen (1962).

65 Hester, esp. pp. 212ff.

66 See Percy, p. 98.

67 Once it is identified, for as Loewenberg (1974-75) says, "a metaphorical utterance is ambiguous because it can be taken as a fake assertion or a metaphor. In concluding that such an utterance fails as an assertion, the hearer identifies it as metaphorical." She argues that metaphors have no truth value but do have "heuristic value." For some recent, mainly linguistic work on metaphor, see Derek Bickerton (1968); Donald Stewart (1970-71); Lawrence R. Wheless (1971) (metaphor is preconceptual language); Brenton Campbell (1969b); Hugo Meier (1963); Douglas Berggren (1962-63); Colin Turbayne (1962); Terence Hawkes (1972); Paul Ricoeur (1974-75); H.-H. Lieb (1964); Christine Brooke-Rose (1958); Werner Abraham and Kurt Braunmüller (1973), esp. pp. 122ff., where the authors "generate" a metaphor; Tudor Vianu (1967) (a good book but not linguistically oriented); Hans Blumberg (1960); and Pierre Caminade (1970). There is also a 1970 Ph.D. thesis in Hebrew (with English summary) by Avishai Margalith. It is a Carnapian "explication . . . of the concept of metaphor using new logical and linguistic methods." I am indebted to Miss Tanya Reinhart for knowledge of this thesis.

68 An attempt to get beyond this rather elementary definition which would be both linguistic and structural may be seen in Jerzy Strzelcelski (1970).

An example of a linguistic analysis of a literary technique (stream of consciousness) is offered in Lisa Dahl (1970).

69 See A. Porqueras Mayo (1957).

70 See Van den Hout (1949).

71 See R. K. Hack (1916).

72 See, to take a few examples, the influential Northrop Frye (1957), P. Van Tieghem (1938), Pierre Kohler (1938), and indeed the whole number of *Helicon*, 2 (1940) devoted to this subject (Actes du IIIème Congrès internationale d'histoire littéraire, Lyon, mai-juin 1939). On specific genres see Paul Strohm (1971); Joseph Schreiner (1971); Terence Y. Mullins (1962) (on petition as a literary form); B. K. Martin (1969); Matthias Waltz (1970); Addison G. Wright (1967); and Archer Taylor (1970).

73 See Bloomfield (1970); W. P. Lehmann (1971); Alfred Hoppe (1970); and Teun A. van Dijk (1970).

74 See, e.g., Jakobson (1966b); Nigel Barley (1972) and (1974); Charles T. Scott (1965); Lyndon Harries (1971); Elli Kōngäs Maranda (1969); Mathilde Hain (1966); Agop Hacikyan (1966); and Fatma M. Mahgoub (1968).

75 I am not here concerned with an accurate and neutral description of a period, cultural, or register language, but have a text-centered goal.

76 English translation by Annette Lavers and Colin Smith (1967). Ohmann (1964) calls the kernel content of a work of art (that upon which theoretically stylistic variation operates) "stylistic zero," no doubt somewhat influenced by Barthes. He refers, however, to the kernel content of a particular work of art.

I have recently discovered that Professor Roman Jakobson (1939) used the term "signe zéro." Style zero, however, does not, like sign zero, rest upon neutralizing oppositions, nor does it connect with the notion of "markedness."

77 (1973), p. 470.

78 See Tallentire (1971b); see also (1971a). The latter issue of *TLS* also contains several significant articles on the computer in stylistic research.

79 See, e.g., Stuart Miller (1967), whose work has, however, a structural and thematic rather than linguistic orientation.

80 Here and in this section I am, of course, talking about stylistics as a mode of analyzing literature. As we have seen above, it also has other functions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABRAHAM, WERNER, AND KURT BRAUNMÜLLER. 1973. "Towards a Theory of Style and Metaphor." *Poetics* 7, 103-48.
- ADAMS, PERCY G. 1973. "The Historical Importance of Assonance to Poets." *PMLA* 88, 8-18.
- AGOSTI, STEFANO. 1971. "I messaggi formali della poesia." *Strumenti critici* 14, 1-38.
- ANON. 1966. *Communications* 8.
- ANON. 1972. *Littérature* 5.
- APPLEWHITE, JAMES. 1964. "Dante's Use of the Extended Simile in the *Inferno*." *Italica* 41, 294-309.
- ARNHEIM, RUDOLF. Forthcoming. "Visual Aspects of Concrete Poetry." *Yearbook of Comparative Criticism*.
- ARRIVÉ, M. 1972. "Problèmes de sémiotique littéraire: les langages de Jarry." *Documents de travail et prépublications (Centro Internazionale di Semiotica e di Linguistica, University of Urbino 15)*.
- BAILEY, RICHARD W. 1971. "Statistics and the Sounds of Poetry." *Poetics* 1, 16-37.
- BAKER, WILLIAM E. 1967. *Syntax in English Poetry 1870-1930 (Perspectives in Criticism 18)*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- BARLEY, NIGEL.
1972. "A Structural Approach to the Proverb and Maxim with Special Reference to the Anglo-Saxon Corpus." *Proverbium* 20, 737-50.
1974. "Structural Aspects of the Anglo-Saxon Riddle." *Semiotica* 10, 143-75.
- BARONE, JOSEPH M. (See Marcus [1974]).
- BARR, JAMES. 1961. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. London: Oxford University Press.
- BARTHES, ROLAND.
1967. *Writing Degree Zero*. Tr. Annette Laveria and Colin Smith. London: Jonathan Cape. French original, Paris, 1953.
1971. "Action Sequences." *Patterns of Literary Style*, ed. Joseph Strelka, *Yearbook of Comparative Criticism*, No. 3, pp. 5-14.
- BASTIDE, ROGER, ed. 1962. *Sens et usages du terme structure dans les sciences humaines et sociales*. The Hague: Mouton.
- BENSE, MAX.
1967. *Semiotik, Allgemeine Theorie der Zeichen (Internationale Reihe Kybernetik und Information 4)*. Baden-Baden: Agis-Verlag.
1962. *Theorie der Texte*. Cologne and Berlin: Verlag Kiepenheuer und Witsch.
- BERGGREN, DOUGLAS. 1962. "The Use and Abuse of Metaphor." *Review of Metaphysics* 16, 237-58, 450-72.
- BERSANI, LEO. 1972. "Is There a Science of Literature?" *Partisan Review* 39, 535-53.
- BESHAROV, JUSTINIA. 1956. *Imagery of the Igor Tale in the Light of Byzantino-Slavic Poetic Theory* (Studies in Russian Epic Tradition). Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- BICKERTON, DEREK. 1968. "Prolegomena to a Linguistic Theory of Metaphor." *Foundations of Language* 4, 34-52.
- BLACK, MAX. 1954-55. "Metaphor." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 55. Rpt. in *Art and Philosophy*, ed. W. E. Kennick. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970.

BLOOMFIELD, MORTON W.

1953. "Final Root-forming Morphemes." *American Speech* 28, 158-64.

1962-63. "A Grammatical Approach to Personification Allegory." *Modern Philology* 60, 161-71.

1967. "The Syncategorematic in Poetry: From Semantics to Syntactics." *To Honor Roman Jakobson*, I, 307-17. The Hague: Mouton.

1970. "Generative Grammar and the Theory of Literature." *Actes du Xe congrès international des linguistes, Bucarest, 20 août-2 septembre 1967*, No. 3, pp. 57-65. Bucharest: Académie de la République Socialiste de Roumanie.

1970-71. "Jakobsonian Poetics and Evaluative Criticism." *University Review* 37, 165-73.

1973. "The Study of Language." *Daedalus*, Summer, 5-13.

BLUMENBERG, HANS. 1960. "Paradigmen zu einer Metaphorologie." *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 6, 7-142.

BOMAN, THORLEIF. 1970. *Hebrew Thought Compared to Greek*. Tr. from German 2nd ed., 1954; rpt. New York: Norton.

BRAINERD, BARRON, AND VICTORIA NEUFELDT. (See Marcus [1974]).

BROOKE-ROSE, CHRISTINE. 1958. *A Grammar of Metaphor*. London: Secker and Warburg.

BROWNE, ROBERT M. 1971-72. "The Typology of Literary Signs." *College English* 33, 1-17.

CAMINADE, PIERRE. 1970. *Image et métaphore, Un problème de poétique contemporaine (Collection études supérieures 36)*. Paris: Bordas.

CAMPBELL, BRENTON. 1969. "Metaphor, Metonymy, and Literalness." *General Linguistics* 9, 149-66.

ČERVENKA, MIROSLAV, AND KVĚTÁ SGALLOVA. 1967. "On a Probabilistic Model of Czech Verse." *Prague Studies in Mathematical Linguistics* 2, 105-20. Prague: Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.

CHABROL, CLAUDE. 1973. "De quelques problèmes de grammaire narrative et textuelle." *Documents de travail et prépublications (Centro Internazionale di Semiotica e di Linguistica, University of Urbino 25)*. To appear in *Semiotique narrative et textuelle*, ed. Chabrol, Paris.

CHABROL, CLAUDE, AND LOUIS MARIN, eds. 1971. *Sémiotique narrative: Récits bibliques*. *Langages* 22.

CHRISTMANN, HANS HELMUT. 1974. "Saussures Anagrammstudien." *RF* 86, 229-38.

CRYSTAL, DAVID, AND DEREK DAVY. 1969. *Investigating English Style (English Language Series)*. London and Harlow: Longmans.

CULLER, JONATHAN.

1971. "Jakobson and the Linguistic Analysis of Literary Texts." *Language and Style* 5, 53-66.

1973. Review of *Literary Style: A Symposium*, ed. Seymour Chatman. *Journal of Linguistics* 9, 356-60.

CUMMINGS, D. W., JOHN HERUM, AND E. K. LYBBERT. 1971. "Semantic Recurrence and Rhetorical Form." *Language and Style* 4, 195-207.

DAHL, LIISA. 1970. *Linguistic Features of the Stream-of-Consciousness Techniques of James Joyce, Virginia Woolf and Eugene O'Neill (Annales Universitatis Turkuensis. Series B. No. 116)*. Turku: Turun Yliopisto.

DARBYSHIRE, A. E. 1971. *A Grammar of Style*. London: André Deutsch.

- DARIAN, STEVEN G. 1973. "Similes and the Creative Process." *Language and Style* 6, 48-57.
- DELBUILLE, PAUL. 1961. *Poésie et sonorités, La critique contemporaine devant le pouvoir suggestif des sons (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège 163)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- DERRIDA, JACQUES. 1975. "White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy." *New Literary History* 6, 5-74.
- DINU, MIHAI. (See Marcus [1974]).
- DOLEŽEL, LUBOMIR. 1967. "The Prague School and the Statistical Theory of Poetic Language." *Prague Studies in Mathematical Linguistics* 2, 97-104. Prague: Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.
- DOLEŽEL, LUBOMIR, AND RICHARD W. BAILEY, eds. 1969. *Statistics and Style: Mathematical Linguistics and Automatic Language Processing*. New York: American Elsevier Pub. Co.
- DONATO, EUGENIO. 1967. "Of Structuralism and Literature." *Modern Language Notes* 82, 549-74.
- DORFMAN, EUGENE. 1969. *The Narreme in the Medieval Romance Epic: An Introduction to Narrative Structures* (University of Toronto Romance Series 13). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- DRESSLER, WOLFGANG. 1972. *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- DUBOIS, J., F. EDELINE, J. M. KLINKENBERG, P. MINGUET, F. PIRE, AND H. TRINON. 1970. *Rhétorique générale (langue et langage)*. Paris: Librairie Larousse.
- DUROT, OSWALD. 1968. *Le structuralisme en linguistique (Qu'est-ce que le structuralisme? 1)*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- ECO, UMBERTO.
1967. *Appunti per una semiologia delle comunicazione visive*. Milan: Bompiani.
1968. *La Struttura assente: Introduzione alla ricerca semiologica*. Milan: Bompiani.
1971. *Le Forme del contenuto*. Milan: Bompiani.
- ELLIS, J. M. 1970. "Linguistics, Literature, and the Concept of Style." *Word* 26, 65-78.
- ENGLER, RUDOLF. 1974. Ed. of Ferdinand de Saussure. *Cours de linguistique générale*, II: 4. Wiesbaden.
- ENKVIST, NILS ERIK.
1964. "On Defining Style: An Essay in Applied Linguistics." *Linguistics and Style*, ed. John Spencer (*Language and Language Learning*), pp. 3-56. London: Oxford University Press.
1973. *Linguistic Stylistics (Janua Linguarum, Series Critica 5)*. The Hague: Mouton.
1974. "Style and Types of Context." *Reports on Text Linguistics: Four Papers on Text, Style and Syntax*, ed. N. E. Enkvist, pp. 29-65. Meddelanden från Stiftelsesens för Åbo Akademi Forskningsinstitut 1.
- ERLICH, VICTOR.
1965. *Russian Formalism—History, Doctrine*. 2nd ed. The Hague: Mouton. 1st ed. 1955.
1973. "Roman Jakobson: Grammar of Poetry and Poetry of Grammar." *Approaches to Poetics*, ed. Seymour Chatman (*Selected Papers from the English Institute*). New York and London: Columbia University Press.
- EVEN-ZOHAR, ITAMAR. 1972. "An Outline of a Theory of the Literary Text." *Hasifrut* 3, 427-50 (in Hebrew, with English abstract).

- FAGES, J.-B. 1968. *Comprendre le structuralisme*. Toulouse: Privat.
- FAIRLEY, IRENE.
 1973a. "Meaning and Syntax . . . Quick in the Death of Things." *Proceedings, Conference on Meaning, University of North Iowa, April 1973*.
 1973b. "Syntactic Deviation and Cohesion." *Language and Style* 6, 216-29.
- FERRARA, FERNANDO. 1974. "Theory and Model for the Structural Analysis of Fiction." *New Literary History* 5, 245-68.
- FISCHER, WALTHER L. (See Marcus [1974]).
- FISH, STANLEY E.
 1972. *Self-Consuming Artifacts: The Experience of Seventeenth-Century Literature*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
 1973. "What is Stylistics and Why are They Saying Such Terrible Things About It?" *Approaches to Poetics*, ed. Seymour Chatman (*Selected Papers from the English Institute*). New York and London: Columbia University Press.
- FÓNAGY, IVAN.
 1961. "Communication in Poetry." *Word* 17, 194-218.
 1963. *Die Metaphern in der Phonetik, Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des wissenschaftlichen Denkens (Janua Linguarum, Series Minor 25)*. The Hague: Mouton.
 1971. "The Functions of Vocal Style." *Literary Style: A Symposium*, ed. Seymour Chatman, pp. 159-76. London and New York: Oxford University Press.
- FOWLER, ROGER. 1971. *The Languages of Literature: Some Linguistic Contributions to Criticism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- FOX, JAMES J. 1973? "On Binary Categories and Primary Symbols: Some Rotinese Perspectives." TS, p. 40.
- FRYE, NORTHROP. 1957. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- FUCKS, WILHELM. 1971. "Possibilities of Exact Style Analysis." *Patterns of Literary Style*, ed. Joseph Strelka. *Yearbook of Comparative Criticism*, No. 3, pp. 51-76.
- FUDGE, ERIK. 1970. "Phonological Structure and Expressiveness." *Journal of Linguistics* 6, 161-88.
- GALPERIN, I. R.
 1971a. "Some Principal Issues of Style and Stylistics as Viewed by Russian Linguists." *Style* 5, 10-13.
 1971b. *Stylistics*, ed. L. R. Todd. Moscow: Higher School Pub. House.
- GANDILLAC, MAURICE DE, LUCIEN GOLDMANN, AND JEAN PIAGET, eds. 1965. *Entretiens sur les notions de genèse et de structure (Centre culturel international de Cerisy-le-Salle . . . 1959)*. Paris and The Hague, 1965.
- GENETTE, GÉRARD. 1972. "Discours du récit: essai de méthode." *Figures* 3, 25-273 (*Collection Tel Quel Poétique*). Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- GENTILHOMME, YVES. (See Marcus [1974]).
- GRAY, BENNISON. 1969. *Style: The Problem and Its Solution (De proprietatibus litterarum, Series Major 3)*. The Hague: Mouton.
- GREIMAS, A. J. 1973. "Un Problème de sémiotique narrative: les objets de valeur." *Langages* 31, 13-35.
- GRIMES, JOSEPH E. 1972. "Outlines and Overlays." *Language* 48, 513-24.
- GRONINGEN, BERNHARD ABRAHAM VAN. 1958. *La Composition littéraire archaïque grecque, Procédés et réalisations (Verhandlungen der K. Nederlandse Akademie*

- van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkund N. R., Deel 65:2). Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.
- GUILLÉN, CLAUDIO. 1957. "Stylistics of Silence" (in Spanish). Rev. and tr. in *Literature as System: Essays Toward the Theory of Literary History*, pp. 221-79. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.
- GUIRAUD, PIERRE. 1970. *La Stylistique*, 6th ed. (*Que Sais-Je* 646). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 1st ed. 1955.
- GUNZENHÄUSER, RUL, AND HELMUT KREUZER, eds. 1967. *Mathematik und Dichtung, Versuche zur Frage einer exakten Literaturwissenschaft*, 2nd ed. (*Sammlung Dialog* 3). Munich: Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung. 1st ed. 1965.
- HACIKYAN, AGOP J. 1966. *A Linguistic and Literary Analysis of Old English Riddles*. Montreal: Casalini.
- HACK, R. K. 1916. "The Doctrine of Literary Forms." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 27, 1-65.
- HAIN, MATHILDE. 1966. *Rätsel (Sammlung Metzler, Realien Bücher für Germanisten)*. Abteilung Poetik M53. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K. 1971. "Linguistic Function and Literary Style: An Inquiry into the Language of William Golding's *The Inheritors*." *Literary Style: A Symposium*, ed. Seymour Chatman, pp. 330-68. London and New York: Oxford University Press.
- HARRIES, LYNDON. 1971. "The Riddle in Africa." *Journal of American Folklore* 84, 377-93.
- HARWEG, ROLAND. 1973. "Text Grammar and Literary Texts: Remarks on a Grammatical Science of Literature." *Poetics* 9, 65-91.
- HAUSENBLAS, KAREL. 1966. "On the Characterization and Classification of Discourses." *L'école de Prague d'aujourd'hui (Travaux linguistiques de Prague 1)*, pp. 67-83. Prague: Académie Tchécoslovaque des Sciences.
- HAWKES, TERENCE. 1972. *Metaphor (The Critical Idiom 25)*. London: Methuen.
- HAYES, CURTIS W. 1968. "A Transformational-Generative Approach to Style: Samuel Johnson and Edward Gibbon." *Language and Style* 1, 39-48.
- HEATH, STEPHEN, COLIN MACCABE, AND CHRISTOPHER PRENDERGAST, eds. 1971. *Signs of the Times*. Cambridge, England.
- HENDRICKS, W. O.
 1967. "On the Notion 'Beyond the Sentence.'" *Linguistics* 37, Dec., 12-51.
 1969. "Three Models for the Description of Poetry." *Journal of Linguistics* 5, 1-22.
 1970. "Folklore and the Structural Analysis of Literary Texts." *Language and Style* 3, 83-121.
 1972a. "The Structural Study of Narration: Sample Analyses." *Poetics*, 100-23.
 1972b. Review of *Grammaire du Décameron* by T. Todorov. *Semiotica* 5, 263-89.
 1973. Review of *Structural Continuity in Poetry* by M. C. Bateson. *Journal of Linguistics* 9, 148-56.
 1974. "The Relation between Linguistics and Literary Studies." *Poetics* 11, 5-21.
- HESTER, MARCUS B. 1967. *The Meaning of Poetic Metaphor: An Analysis in the Light of Wittgenstein's Claim that Meaning is Use*. The Hague: Mouton.

- HIATT, MARY P. 1973. "The Prevalence of Parallelism: A Preliminary Investigation by Computer." *Language and Style* 6, 117-26.
- HILL, ARCHIBALD A. 1958. *Introduction to Linguistic Structures: From Sound to Sentence in English*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co.
- HOFSTADTER, ALBERT. 1965. *Truth and Art*. New York and London: Columbia University Press.
- HOLLANDER, JOHN.
1969. *Types of Shape*. New York: Atheneum.
1973. "'Sense Variouslly Drawn Out': Some Observations on English Enjambement." *Literary Theory and Structure: Essays in Honor of William K. Wimsatt*, ed. Frank Brady, John Palmer, and Martin Price, pp. 201-25. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- HOPPE, ALFRED. 1970. "Linguistische Methoden semantischer Textanalyse." *Text, Bedeutung, Ästhetik*, ed. S. J. Schmidt, pp. 80-105. Munich: Bayerischer Schulbuch-Verlag.
- HORALEK, KAREL. 1966. "Les fonctions de la langue et de la parole." *L'école de Prague d'aujourd'hui (Travaux linguistiques de Prague 1)*, pp. 41-46. Prague: Académie Tchèqueoslovaque des Sciences.
- HOUGH, GRAHAM. 1969. *Style and Stylistics (Concepts of Literature)*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- HŘEBÍČEK, LUDÉK. 1966. "An Attempt at Quantitative Analysis of Rhymes (in Abay Kunanbayef's Poetry)." *Prague Studies in Mathematical Linguistics* 1, 105-12. Prague: Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.
- HRUSHOVSKI, BENJAMIN. 1968-69. "Do Sounds Have Meaning? The Problem of Expressiveness of Sound-Patterns in Poetry." *Hasifrut* 1, 410-20 (in Hebrew, with English abstract).
- HUNGERLAND, ISABEL. 1958. *Poetic Discourse (University of California Publications in Philosophy 33)*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- IHWE, JENS. 1972. "On the Foundations of a General Theory of Narrative Structure." *Poetics* 3, 5-14.
- JAKOBSON, ROMAN.
1939. "Signe zéro." *Mélanges de linguistique offerts à Charles Bally*, pp. 143-52. Geneva: Georg et Cie.
1960. "Linguistics and Poetics." *Style in Language*, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok, pp. 350-77. Cambridge, New York, and London: The Technology Press of MIT and John Wiley and Sons.
1962. "Les Chats de Charles Baudelaire," with Claude Lévi-Strauss. *L'Homme* 2, 5-21.
1963. "On the So-Called Vowel Alliteration in Germanic Verse." *ZPSK* 16, 85-94.
1966a. "Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet." *Language* 42, 399-429.
1966b. "Retrospect." *Selected Writings*. IV, 637-44. The Hague: Mouton.
1968. "Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry." *Lingua* 21, 225-32 (a revised English version of an earlier paper which had appeared in various languages and versions).
1970. *Shakespeare's Verbal Art in "The Expence of Spirit"*. The Hague: Mouton.
1971. *Roman Jakobson, A Bibliography of His Writings (Janua Linguarum, Series Minor 134)*. The Hague.

1973. *Questions de Poétique (Collection poétique)*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- KAWIN, BRUCE F. 1972. *Telling It Again and Again: Repetition in Literature and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- KOCH, WALTER A.
1965. "Preliminary Sketch of a Semantic Type of Discourse Analysis." *Linguistics* 12, 5-30.
1966a. *Recurrence and a Three-Modal Approach to Poetry*. The Hague: Mouton.
1966b. "Einige Probleme der Textanalyse." *Lingua* 16, 383-98.
- KOHLER, PIERRE. 1940. "Contribution à une philosophie des genres" (*Actes du IIIème congrès internationale d'histoire littéraire*, Lyon, mai-juin, 1939). *Helicon* 2, 2-3 (whole issue).
- KRAMER, S. N. 1969. "Sumerian Similes: A Panoramic View of Some of Man's Oldest Literary Images." *JAOs* 89, 1-10.
- KRÁMSKÝ, JIŘÍ. 1967. "The Frequency of Articles in Relation to Style in English." *Prague Studies in Mathematical Linguistics* 2, 89-95. Prague: Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.
- KRISTEVA, JULIA.
1969a. *Σημιωτική, Recherches pour une sémanalyse, Essais (Collection Tel Quel)*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
1969b. "Narration et transformation." *Semiotica* 1, 422-48.
1970. *Le Texte du roman: approche sémiologique d'une structure discursive transformationnelle (Approaches to Semiotics 6)*. The Hague: Mouton.
- KUHNS, RICHARD. 1970. *Structures of Experience: Essays on Affinity Between Philosophy and Literature*. New York: Basic Books.
- KUMMER, W. 1972. "Outlines of a Model for a Grammar of Discourse." *Poetics* 3, 29-55.
- LANDON, GEORGE M. 1968. "The Grammatical Description of Poetic Word-Order in English Verse." *Language and Style* 1, 194-200.
- LAUSBERG, HEINRICH. 1960. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. Munich: Hueber.
- LEBEK, W. D. 1969. "Zur rhetorischen Theorie des Archaismus." *Hermes* 97, 57-78.
- LEED, JACOB, ed. 1966. *The Computer and Literary Style: Introductory Essays and Studies (Kent Studies in English 2)*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press.
- LEFEBRE, MAURICE-JEAN. 1971. "Rhétorique du récit." *Poetics* 2, 119-34.
- LEHMANN, W. P. 1971. "Generative Sprachwissenschaft und Literaturwissenschaft." *Dichtung, Sprache, Gesellschaft (Akten des IV Internationalen Germanisten Kongresses 1970 in Princeton)*, ed. Victor Lange and Hans-Gert Roloff, pp. 127-44. Frankfurt: Athenäum-Verlag.
- LEMON, LEE T., AND MARION J. REIS, eds. 1965. *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays (Regents Critics Series)*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- LEONDAR, BARBARA. 1968. *The Structures and Function of Metaphor*. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
- LEPAGE, R. B. 1959. "Alliterative Patterns as a Test of Style in Old English Poetry." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 58, 434-41.
- LESTER, MARK. 1968-69. "The Relation of Linguistics to Literature." *College English* 30, 366-75.
- LEVIN, SAMUEL.
1963a. "Deviation—Statistical and Determinate—in Poetic Language." *Lingua* 12, 276-90.

- 1963b. "Aspects of Semantic and Grammatical Change." *Linguistics* 2, 26-37.
1964. "Poetry and Grammaticalness." *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists*, ed. Horace G. Lunt, pp. 308-14. The Hague: Mouton.
- 1965a. "Two Grammatical Approaches to Poetic Analysis." *College Composition and Communication* 16, 256-60.
- 1965b. "Internal and External Deviation in Poetry." *Word* 2, 225-31.
1971. "The Analysis of Compression in Poetry." *Foundations of Language* 7, 38-55.
- LIEB, HANS-HEINRICH. 1964. *Der Umfang des historischen Metaphernbegriffs*. Inaugural Dissertation . . . der Universität Köln. Hannover: Privately printed.
- LOEWENBERG, INA. 1974-75. "Identifying metaphors." *Foundations of Language* 12, 315-38.
- LONGACRE, ROBERT. 1970. "Sentence Structure as a Statement Calculus." *Language* 46, 738-815.
- MCINERNEY, RALPH.
1961. *The Logic of Analogy: An Interpretation of St. Thomas*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
1968. *Studies in Analogy*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- MACKSEY, RICHARD, AND EUGENIO DONATO, eds. 1970. *The Structuralist Controversy: The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- MAGLIOLA, ROBERT. 1973. "Parisian Structuralism Confronts Phenomenology." *Language and Style* 6, 237-48.
- MAHGOUB, FATMA M. 1968. *A Linguistic Study of Cairene Proverbs (Language Science Monographs 1)*. Bloomington and The Hague: Indiana University Press and Mouton.
- MANIGNE, JEAN-PIERRE. 1972. "Le sens du poème." *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 56, 4-18.
- MARANDA, ELLI KÖNGÄS. 1969. "Structure des enigmes." *L'Homme* 9, 5-48.
- MARANDA, ELLI KÖNGÄS AND PIERRE. 1971. *Structural Models in Folklore and Transformational Essays (Approaches to Semiotics 10)*. The Hague: Mouton.
- MARCUS, SOLOMON.
1970. "Questions de poétique algébrique." *Actes du Xe congrès international des linguistes, Bucarest, 28 août-2 septembre 1967*, No. 3, pp. 67-76. Bucharest: Editions de l'Académie de la République Socialiste de Roumanie.
1974. Ed. *Poetics and Mathematics, Poetics* 10 (articles by René Thom, I. I. Revsin, Ladislav Nebeský, Barron Brainerd and Victoria Neufeldt, Walther L. Fischer, Siegfried Maser, Joseph M. Barone, Yves Gentilhomme, and Mihai Dinu).
- MARGALITH, AVISHAI. 1970. *The Cognitive Status of Metaphors* (typewritten English summary of Ph.D. Hebrew thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem).
- MARTIN, B. K. 1969. "The Lament of the Old Woman of Beare: A Critical Evaluation." *MAE* 38, 245-61.
- MARTINI, FRITZ. 1971. "Personal Style and Period Style: Perspectives on a Theme of Literary Research." *Patterns of Literary Style*, ed. Joseph Strelka, *Yearbook of Comparative Criticism*, No. 3, pp. 90-115.
- MASER, SIEGFRIED. (See Marcus [1974]).
- MATTHEWS, ROBERT J. 1971. "Concerning a 'Linguistic Theory' of Metaphor." *Foundations of Language* 7, 413-25.

- MEIER, HUGO. 1963. *Die Metapher, Versuch einer zusammenfassenden Betrachtung ihrer linguistischen Merkmale*. Winterthur: P. G. Keller.
- MELHEM, D. H. 1973. "Ivan Fonagy and Paul Delbouille: Sonority Structures in Poetic Languages." *Language and Style* 6, 206-15.
- MEYER, LEONARD B. 1956. *Emotion and Meaning in Music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MEYERS, C. MASON. 1965-66. "The Circular Use of Metaphor." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 26, 391-402.
- MILES, JOSEPHINE.
1948-51. *The Continuity of Poetic Language*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. Rpt. New York, 1965.
1964. *Eras and Modes in English Poetry*. Rev. ed. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
1967. *Style and Proportion: The Language of Prose and Poetry*. Boston: Little Brown.
- MILLER, STUART. 1967. *The Picaresque Novel*. Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University Press.
- MOUNIN, GEORGES. 1970. *Introduction à la Sémiologie (Le Sens Commun)*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.
- MUKAROVSKÝ, JAN.
1964. "Standard Language and Poetic Language." Tr. in Paul Garvin, ed., *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style*, pp. 17-30. Washington: Georgetown University Press. 1st ed. 1955.
1971. *La funzione, la norma e il valore estetico come fatti sociali*, tr. Sergio Corduas (*Nuovo Politecnico* 41). Turin: Einaudi.
- MULLINS, TERENCE. 1962. "Petition as a Literary Form." *Novum Testamentum* 5, 46-54.
- NEBESKÝ, LADISLAV. (See Marcus [1974]).
- NELSON, CARY. 1973. *The Incarnate Word: Literature as Verbal Space*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- NELSON, MARIE. 1973. "Submorphemic Values: Their Contribution to Pattern and Meaning in the *Morte Arthure*." *Language and Style* 6, 289-96.
- OHMANN, RICHARD.
1964. "Generative Grammars and the Concept of Literary Style." *Word* 20, 423-39.
1966. "Literature as Sentences." *College English* 27, 261-67.
- PAVEL, THOMAS G. 1973. "Some Remarks on Narrative Grammars." *Poetics* 8, 5-30.
- PAZ, OCTAVIO. 1971. *Claude Lévi-Strauss: An Introduction*, tr. J. S. and Maxine Bernstein. London: Jonathan Cape (original 1967).
- PELC, JERZY. 1971. "On the Concept of Narration." *Semiotica* 3, 1-19.
- PERCY, WALKER. 1958. "Metaphor as Mistake." *Sewanee Review* 66, 79-99.
- PETÖFI, JÁNOS S. 1972. "The Syntactico-Semantic Organization of Text-Structures." *Poetics* 3, 56-99.
- PETSCH, ROBERT. 1900. *Formelhaft Schlüsse im Volksmärchen*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- PORQUERAS Y MAYO, A. 1957. *El prólogo como género literario, Su estudio en el siglo de oro español* (*Instituto 'Miguel de Cervantes' de Filología hispanica, Anejos de Revista de Literatura* 14). Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

- PRAWER, SIEGBERT S. 1969. "Some Recent Language Games." *Essays in German Language, Culture and Society*, ed. Siegbert S. Prawer, R. Hinton Thomas, and Leonard Forster, pp. 69-83. London: University of London Institute of Germanic Studies.
- PRENTICE, ROBERT. 1973. "The Linguistic and Value Structures of Irony." *Antonianum* 48, 234-47.
- PROPP, VLADIMIR. 1958. *Morphology of the Folktale*, tr. Laurence Scott. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 24:4, no. 3 (*Publication 10 of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology and Linguistics*). Philadelphia: American Folklore Society (written in Russian in 1929).
- REDIN, MATS. 1925. *Word-Order in English Verse from Pope to Sassoon* (*Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift* 2).
- RENARD, JEAN-CLAUDE. 1970. *Notes sur la poésie*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- REVZIN, I. I. (See Marcus [1974]).
- RICHARDS, I. A.
 1924. *Principles of Literary Criticism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
 1935. *Science and Poetry*. 2nd ed. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner (1st ed. 1926).
 1974a. "Factors and Functions in Linguistics," in I. A. Richards, *Poetries: Their Media and Ends* . . . , ed. Trevor Eaton, pp. 1-16. The Hague: Mouton (original in *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 1972).
 1974b. "Linguistics into Poetics," in I. A. Richards, *Poetries*, pp. 39-49 (original in *TLS*, 28 May 1970).
 1974c. "Reversals in Poetry," in I. A. Richards, *Poetries*, pp. 59-70 (original, a Broadcast in winter of 1957-58 over WGBH-Boston).
- RICOEUR, PAUL. 1974. "Metaphor and the Main Problem of Hermeneutics." *New Literary History* 6, 95-110.
- RIFFATERRE, MICHAEL.
 1964. "The Stylistic Function." *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists*, ed. Horace E. Lunt, pp. 316-23. The Hague: Mouton.
 1966. "Describing Poetic Structures: Two Approaches to Baudelaire's *Les Chats*." *Tale French Studies* 36-37, 200-42.
- ROBINSON, FRED C. 1973. "Syntactical Glosses in Latin Manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Provenance." *Speculum* 48, 443-75.
- RØDER, VIGGO. 1972. "Sémiotique du conte." *Poetics* 6, 50-71.
- ROSEN, CHARLES. 1971. *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven*. New York: The Viking Press.
- RUWET, NICHOLAS. 1968. "Limites de l'analyse linguistique en poétique." *Linguistique et littératures, Languages* 12, 57-70.
- SAFOUAN, MOUSTAFA. 1968. *Le structuralisme en psych analyse (Qu'est-ce que le structuralisme? 4)*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- SAID, EDWARD W. 1973. "The Text as Practice and as Idea." *Modern Language Notes* 88, 1071-1101.
- SCHAPIRO, MEYER. 1953. "Style." *Anthropology Today*, ed. A. L. Kroeber. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- SCHMIDT, SIEGFRIED J.
 1970. Ed. *Text Bedeutung Ästhetik (Grundfragen der literaturwissenschaft 1)*. Munich: Bayerischer Schulbuch Verlag.
 1971. *Ästhetische Prozesse, Beiträge zu einer Theorie der nicht-mimetischen Kunst und Literatur (Pocket 20)*. Cologne and Berlin: Verlag Kiepenheuer und Witsch.

1973. "On the Foundation and the Research Strategies of a Science of Literary Communication." *Poetics* 7, 1-35.
- SCHREINER, JOSEPH. 1971. "Formen und Gattungen im Alten Testament." *Einführung in die Methoden der biblischen Exegese*, ed. Joseph Schreiner, pp. 194-231. Würzburg: Echter Verlag.
- SCHWARTZ, ELIAS. 1970-71. "Notes on Linguistics and Literature." *College English* 32, 184-90.
- SCOTT, CHARLES T. 1965. "Persian and Arabic Riddles: A Language-Centered Approach to Genre Definition." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 31: 4 (Part II).
- SEARLE, JOHN. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SEIDLER, HERBERT. 1970. "Der Begriff des Sprachstils in der Literaturwissenschaft." *Sprachkunst, Beiträge zur Literaturwissenschaft* 1, 1-19.
- SEMPROUX, ANDRÉ.
1960. "Trois principes fondamentaux de l'analyse du style." *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 38, 809-14.
1961. "Notes, sur l'histoire des mots 'style' et 'stylistique.'" *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 39, 736-46.
- SHORT, M. H. 1973. "Some Thoughts on Foregrounding and Interpretation." *Language and Style* 6, 97-108.
- SMITH, BARBARA HERRNSTEIN.
1968. *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1971. "Poetry as Fiction." *New Literary History* 2, 259-81.
- SMITH, CARLOTA S. 1971. "Sentences in Discourse: An Analysis of a Discourse by Bertrand Russell." *Journal of Linguistics* 7, 213-35.
- SNELL, BRUNO. 1955. *Die Entdeckung des Geistes*. 3rd ed. Hamburg: Claassen.
- SÖHNGEN, GOTTLIEB. 1962. *Analogie und Metapher, Kleine Philosophie und Theologie der Sprache (Studium universale)*. Freiburg: Alber.
- SPERBER, DAN. 1968. *Le Structuralisme en anthropologie (Qu'est-ce que le structuralisme? 3)*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- SPITZER, LEO. 1948. *Linguistics and Literary History: Essays in Stylistics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- STAROBINSKI, JEAN. 1971. *Les mots sous les mots: Les anagrammes de Ferdinand de Saussure (Le Chemin)*. Paris: Gallimard.
- STEWART, DONALD. 1970-71. "Metaphor and Paraphrase." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 4, 111-23.
- STROHM, PAUL. 1971. "Storie, Spelle, Geste, Romaunce, Tragedie: Generic distinctions in the Middle English Troy Narratives." *Speculum* 46, 348-59.
- STRZETELSKI, JERZY. 1970. *The English Sonnet: Syntax and Style (Universita Jagellonica, Acta Scientiarum Litterarumque 213, Schedae grammaticae, fasc. 27)*. Cracow: Nakladem Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- TALLENTIRE, D. R.
1971a. "Mathematical Modelling in Stylistics: Its Extent and General Limitations." *The Computer in Literary and Linguistic Research, Papers from a Cambridge Symposium*, ed. R. A. Wisbey, pp. 117-28 (*Publications of the Literary and Linguistic Computing Centre* 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1971b. "The Mathematics of Style." *TLS*, 13 Aug., pp. 973-74.
- TAYLOR, ARCHER. 1970. "The Anecdote: A Neglected Genre." *Medieval Litera-*

- ture and Folklore Studies: Essays in Honor of Francis Lee Utley*, ed. Jerome Mandel and Bruce A. Rosenberg, pp. 223-28. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- THOM, RENÉ. (See Marcus [1974]).
- THOMPSON, JOHN. 1961. "Linguistic Structure and the Poetic Line." *Poetics*, ed. Donald Davie. Warsaw: Polish Academy of Sciences.
- THORNE, JAMES P. 1965. "Stylistics and Generative Grammars." *Journal of Linguistics* 1, 49-59.
- TODOROV, TZVETAN.
1968. *Poétique (Qu'est-ce que le structuralisme? 2)*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
1969. *Grammaire du Décameron*. The Hague: Mouton.
1970. "Les Transformations narratives." *Poétique* 3.
1971-72. "The 2 Principles of Narrative," tr. Philip E. Lewis. *Diacritics* 1, 37-44.
- TRABANT, JÜRGEN. 1970. *Zur Semiologie des literarischen Kunstwerks, Glossematik und Literaturtheorie (International Library of General Linguistics 6)*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink.
- TURBAYNE, COLIN. 1962. *The Myth of Metaphor*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- VALESIO, PAOLO.
1967. *Strutture dell'allitterazione: grammatica, retorica e folklore verbale (Saggi Zanichelli 3)*. Bologna: Zanichelli.
1969. "Esquisse pour une étude des personifications." *Lingua e Stile* 4:1, 1-21.
- VAN DEN HOUT, MICHIEL. 1949. "Studies in Early Greek Letter-writing." *Mnemosyne*, Series 4, No. 2, pp. 19-41.
- VAN DIJK, TEUN A.
1970. "Neuere Entwicklungen in der literarischen Semantik." *Text, Bedeutung, Ästhetik*, ed. S. J. Schmidt, pp. 106-35. Munich: Bayerischer Schulbuch-Verlag.
1972. *Some Aspects of Text Grammars: A Study in Theoretical Linguistics and Poetics*. The Hague: Mouton.
- VAN TIEGHEM, P. 1938. "La question des genres littéraires." *Helicon* 1, 95-101.
- VARGA, A. KIBÉDI. 1963. *Les constantes du poème, A la recherche d'une poétique dialectique*. The Hague: Mouton.
- VENDLER, HELEN.
1966. Review of Roger Fowler, *Essays on Style and Language. Essays in Criticism* 16, 457-63.
1973. "Jakobson, Richards, and Shakespeare's Sonnet CXXIX." *I. A. Richards: Essays in His Honor*, ed. Reuben Brower, Helen Vendler, and John Hollander. New York and London: Oxford University Press.
- VIANU, TUDOR. 1967. *Los problemas de la metáfora (Colección ensayos)*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba editorial Universitaria de Buenos Aires (tr. of first part of original Romanian work written 1957).
- VIET, JEAN. 1965. *Les Méthodes structurales dans les sciences sociales*. The Hague: Mouton.
- WAHL, FRANÇOIS. 1973. *Philosophie (Qu'est-ce que le structuralisme? 5)*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- WALTZ, MATTHIAS. 1970. "Zum Problem der Gattungsgeschichte im Mittelalter, Am Beispiel des Mirakels." *ZRP* 86, 22-39.
- WEISSENBERGER, KLAUS. 1971. "The Problem of Period Style in the Theory of

- Recent Literary Criticism: A Comparison." *Patterns of Literary Style*, ed. Joseph Strelka, *Yearbook of Comparative Criticism*, No. 3, pp. 226-64.
- WELLEK, RENÉ. 1972-73. "The Attack on Literature." *The American Scholar* 42, 27-42.
- WELLS, RULON. 1960. "Nominal and Verbal Style." *Style in Language*, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok, pp. 213-20. Cambridge, New York, and London: Technology Press of MIT and John Wiley and Sons.
- WHEELESS, LAWRENCE. 1971. "A Functional Theory of Metaphor." *Language and Style* 4, 273-78.
- WHORF, BENJAMIN LEE. 1956. *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings*, ed. John B. Carroll. Cambridge, Mass.: Technology Press of MIT.
- WRIGHT, ADDISON G. 1967. *The Literary Genre, Midrash*. New York: Alba House.